

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 6428. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, in order to correct certain inequities in the computation of service in the Coast Guard Women's Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6429. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6430. A bill to provide for the granting of mineral rights in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6431. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of futures trading in coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6432. A bill to modernize the pension programs for certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 6433. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 6434. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 6435. A bill to amend section 105 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, with respect to the disposition upon the death of a Member of the House of Representatives of amounts held for him in the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and of other amounts due such Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 6436. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act so as to include nematocides, plant regulators, defoliants, and desiccants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 6437. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6438. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 6439. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal-aid primary system of highways for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNS or Hawaii:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of August 15, 1959, to September 15, 1959, inclusive, as National Allergy Month; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. LANE presented a memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact no legislation restricting the further importation of residual

oil from nations friendly disposed toward the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6440. A bill for the relief of the estate of Samuel Grier, Jr., deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6441. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Vincent J. Relly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6443. A bill for the relief of Donald P. Sevrens and W. A. Busch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6444. A bill for the relief of Lee E. Ai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6445. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6446. A bill for the relief of Luciano Soto y Carballal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 6447. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Luisa D. Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6448. A bill for the relief of James Joseph Shaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6450. A bill for the relief of Roland Mishutani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Mary Miharu Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of Antonino Catania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Business in the 86th Congress

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a good neighbor of Arizona, delivered an address to the Western Highway Institute convention in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 6, which is recommended reading for anyone who wants information as to the march of population and industry in the great Southwest.

In it is an accurate summary of what the Congress has done to develop a highway system which has for its objective the movement of persons and things from where they are to where they are

needed at less cost and in less time. He also has illustrated what needs to be done in furtherance of this purpose.

There is a nationwide demand for water, and there is no one better qualified than the Senator from New Mexico to state, as he did in his address, the progress which has been made toward meeting this imperative demand.

All the Senator from New Mexico said in Phoenix was informative, and to make his remarks available to a wider audience I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BUSINESS IN THE 86TH CONGRESS

Your program committee gave me an easy topic for this noontime talk: "Business in the 86th Congress"—easy because it admits of many different treatments. I might confine my talk solely to the way the 86th Congress is likely to conduct its own business, the

interferences that may come from extraneous issues, and the delays in enacting legislation that may result. Or I might discuss what business can expect from the 86th Congress—what laws we will pass with reference to income taxes, life insurance, trucking, water development, atomic energy, and allied subjects. Finally, in view of the great number of investigations already under way or about to be authorized, my theme might well be "Who Gets the Business, Why, and Where."

Naturally I will have a little trouble restraining myself on my favorite theme. Rather steadily these past few months, I have been talking and writing about the atom, its place in the home, its role in industry, its effect upon our laws and our lawyers, and the general problem of fallout; and today I could try to tune you in on what I regard as one of the most fascinating subjects now before the people of the earth.

Perhaps I might better start with a few words about what the 86th Congress has been doing these first 3 months, particularly as its actions relate to business.

Of first importance is the passage of the Hawaiian statehood bill, the addition of a 50th star to the flag. Today we are in the State which gave the 48th star to the flag and for 47 years held the distinction of being the last State admitted to the Union. For nearly half a century, when a new Representative of Arizona came into the Congress, he took the bottom of each committee list because committee assignments go by seniority and if seniority is equal, then by the order in which the States were admitted to the Union. Many times I've heard your Arizona people remark how they went to the absolute foot of the totem pole. Now come Alaska and Hawaii to move Arizona and New Mexico up a couple of notches, and we join with you in pleasure at our new prominence.

The Senate has passed a housing bill which provides \$2.7 billion; has extended the Draft Act for 4 years in the pattern that the President requested; has passed an airport bill providing \$465 million over a 4-year period; has added \$48 million to the funds available to the new Space Agency to advance Project Mercury—the man in space—and to develop and test a new rocket engine. And finally, because it relates directly to business, it has passed a depressed area bill involving \$390 million. Democrats thought the sum a minimum. Most Republicans thought it too large. One party's meat is the other party's poison. We learned that again when we extended some special unemployment compensation benefits, which we did in the final closing hours before the Easter recess.

Here in Arizona, I surely should mention the fact that the Senate Committee on Finance has been busy with hearings on a new proposal to change the basis for the taxation of life insurance companies. That deserves mention in Arizona because in 1950 there were two life insurance companies domiciled in New Mexico and three in Arizona. Today there are still 2 in New Mexico and 81 in Arizona. This State chartered more new life insurance companies than any State in the Union except Texas and if you add the State of Texas, Arizona and Texas started about as many new life insurance companies as all the rest of the Nation put together. I don't know what makes life insurance suddenly so attractive for Arizona and Texas companies, but perhaps an examination of the tax-free income possibilities could supply you with an answer.

The Senate has authorized the Joint Economic Committee to make an economic inventory of the United States. There is a background for that. The Senate Finance Committee on which I serve has made a long study on the financial condition of the United States, has filled 1,606 pages of printed testimony with theories, explanations and comment on what has been going on in our financial world. You and I will not need 1,600 pages to understand it. We know that if we deposited \$100 in a bank 2 years ago, never wrote a check against it, just allowed it to lie in the bank, subject to the erosion of the dollar now going on, that \$100 is worth \$93 today. Inflation did that. And when there is that much inflation in the United States, whether creeping or galloping, interest rates will go up, true values will go down, businessmen will be affected, and people will want to see what Congress can learn about inflation as it sweeps across the land.

So that's a part of what the 86th Congress has been doing so far this year that might be of direct interest to business.

But my mail would indicate that businessmen are not concerned alone with taxes, inflation and unemployment. Through all the rather dull pattern of these inquiries there is woven in like a red thread the question of Berlin.

"What's going on?" they want to know. "Is Khrushchev bluffing? What will happen in May? If my children go to Europe this summer, will they be caught in a nuclear disaster? If war starts, how long will it last?"

If you find someone with exact answers to all these questions, send him to the missing persons section of the State Department; we have needed him a long time. But exact answers may not be required. What the Russians do may be influenced by what the free world does. Maybe I can give you one man's opinion.

A united front by the United States and her allies is essential if we are to deal successfully with the recurring world crises.

More important is unity among U.S. leaders, and the stand taken by the country's leaders must be understood and supported by the people. Businessmen like you must make a serious effort to be and remain informed on the problems facing your Nation's Government.

The U.S. position on Berlin is united. Democrats and Republicans alike are in agreement with the sentiments expressed on the floor of the Senate last month by Senator FULBRIGHT, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator FULBRIGHT listed three points on which there is complete unity in this country:

The United States will make no separate deals with the Soviet Union.

It will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or West Germany.

It will not accept, even tacitly, any propositions designed to formalize the subjugation of the once-free satellite peoples.

Berlin is the world's most important symbol of freedom. Because of this, more than because of its value as a city, it must be protected. It is an island of freedom in a sea of communism, and it must remain free.

Once the Russians understand that, and respect it, then there may be points that can be negotiated.

This is one audience that may be interested more than most others in the Berlin crisis, because here we have a problem that revolves around the highway—the highway which connects the island of West Berlin to the Bonn Government which in turn is tied to the rest of Western Europe. Remember that the United States, France, and Britain have their own zones and spheres of influence in Western Germany, and they are attempting to keep open their lines to Berlin. Over the highway which connects West Berlin with Bonn, roll constant thousands of trucks supplying the city. It was the blocking of the highway which precipitated the first Berlin crisis in 1948. Now the East Germans are threatening once again to cut off the highway which is the lifeline of the new city.

We need to keep constantly in mind the fact that it is not distances but distinctions which cause a fair share of this trouble. The end of World War I saw the establishment of the Polish corridor through Germany. It was a narrow strip of land, but it had high significance. After World War I, I talked with a distinguished statesman of a European nation. I asked him why that little strip of land disturbed him so. His reply was that the Polish corridor was not wide, but it was wide enough to bar forever the guarantee of peace for Europe as long as it existed.

Now again another little strip of land, the little highway that leads into West Berlin from West Germany, may embrace scant acreage, but may be sufficient to promise that a Berlin crisis or something similar to it, can fret us constantly as long as you live and as long as our children may live. It is a tiny highway but it could be the path over which we could travel to world war III.

Maybe I am a pessimist, but I do not look for any quick and easy relief from the tensions that now grip the world. Today it is Berlin; yesterday it was Lebanon, and the day before that it was Quemoy. Last week it was Korea; tomorrow, God knows. Wherever the force of worldwide communism can reach, even into the sacred temples of Tibet, the drive will be on. You and I and our children must be prepared to adjust our lives to it, to stand firm against it, and as Senator FULBRIGHT has suggested, to "chip away relentlessly at the encrusted Communist mixture of dogma, braggadocio, and fear that contributes so much to keeping world peace in a recurring state of serious jeopardy."

World tension, then, is part of the task of the 86th Congress and part of the responsibility the Congress feels toward business. Our world, which was once so large that it defied man's imagination, is now so small that we live neighbor to all creation. Instead of going around the world in 80 days—an unbelievable feat in the time of Jules Verne—we can travel by jet around the world in 80 hours. A missile or spaceship with a man aboard will soon be making the circuit in 80 minutes. Photon propulsion may sail us from Venus to Mars, and nuclear retrorockets may guarantee safe landing on the farthest planet. I'm no pessimist on space travel.

But the world is being shrunk by means other than jets and missiles and communications. One of the biggest problems which we will have to face in the future will be the shrinking of the world's available living space by a population growth which has properly been termed an explosion.

For Old Mother Earth is in the midst of her greatest baby boom. The United Nations population commission now estimates that in 16 years the earth will contain a billion people more than it does today. It believes that the rate of population increase during the second half of the present century will be twice that of the first half. In numbers, the U.N. predicts by the year 1976 a world population of 3,830 million; by the year 2000, a population of 6,280 million. And there is reason to believe that the U.N. forecasts are conservative.

The population explosion creates new pressures and new problems.

It is creating an irrepressible demand for elbow room, for more space, for new land for overcrowded nations. It is creating the same types of pressures which have historically led to the world's great wars.

The problems are magnified by the fact that the greatest population increase is coming in the lesser developed countries—brought about by a spectacular decline in death rates coupled with little change in traditionally high birth rates. The population is growing so fast in countries like China and India that they are unable to develop their economies. They are hard-pressed to maintain even their present low standards of living. Naturally they are looking around at other countries, rich industrial countries with high standards of living. Their leaders are coveting their neighbor's riches.

China by 1975 will have a population of more than 900 million, according to U.N. estimates—more than a quarter of the total world population, nearly 4 times the population of the United States. China's population by 1975 will be more than twice the combined population of the United States and Russia. China is regarded as a satellite of Russia, but by 1975 the satellite, three times as big as its Communist brother, may become the star.

China today has too many people to realize her economic or military potential. But she is apparently bent on converting her weakness into strength by revolutionary economic methods. She is outcommunizing

Russia. By the tightest of controls she is directing her masses into productive channels, trying to avoid the dissipation of scarce capital which would result if these masses were allowed to live on more than a bare subsistence level. She is transforming her excess people into economic betterment by vast schemes of public construction.

If China's population and economic growth continue at their present rates, she obviously will soon become the strongest contender for world leadership. Such a mass of humans, equipped with modern arms and disciplined by a dictatorship, would prove difficult to contain if it were bent on conquest at any cost.

John King Fairbank, professor of history at Harvard, in his book, "The United States and China," says: "As the earth shrinks and the peoples proliferate, we will soon be living on the same planet with a billion Chinese. We have something to think about."

So you can see to what crises the world's population explosion might lead. These are the types of world problems which must be reckoned with by every individual.

But the baby boom has meaning at home. The population of the United States today is 176 million, but by 1967—only a few years away—it is expected to reach 250 million.

Where will these new people be going? Where will they live? And how?

Every time God skims the milk of civilization, He pours the cream over the western side of the bowl. As a region the West, particularly the Far West and those southwestern areas that we refer to fondly as the Spanish borderlands, are growing faster than the rest of the country. Take a look at some figures:

The Bureau of the Census reports that between 1950 and 1958, population in the 11 Western States increased 27.6 percent, while growth for the United States as a whole was 15 percent. Nevada led the national parade with a growth of 66.7 percent. Florida had 60.3 percent, and Delaware and Maryland were in the first 10; but for the West, Arizona had 52.1 percent, California 35.4 percent, Colorado 29.1 percent, Utah 25.5 percent, and New Mexico 23.6 percent. Texas, I am happy to report, ran a little behind New Mexico. Washington and Oregon were just above the national average.

As with the States, so with the cities. Los Angeles has been adding population at the rate of 16,000 per month, adding every year about the equivalent of a city the size of Des Moines, Iowa, or Hartford, Conn., or—stick with the West—of Spokane, Tucson, El Paso, or Albuquerque.

This stupendous growth is amazing arithmetically, but brings problems that seem to increase in geometric proportion. In Los Angeles alone enough dwelling units were built between 1946 and 1956 to house the combined populations of Philadelphia and Boston, or if you would rather keep your thoughts farther west, enough new houses to take care of the combined populations of Houston, Dallas, Denver, and St. Louis.

Naturally the 86th Congress has to keep looking at population growth and try to determine the problems posed to business and all segments of our economy by this growth. It needs to ask and answer what must be done to meet them.

First of all in your interests are roads. We live in an area of magnificent distances, and when we turn to the trail, it's a long, long trail that winds from Seattle to San Diego or from the Columbia River to the Rio Grande. Through the years we have been learning that if the road job is to be done, the Federal Government must be a partner to the State, the county and even to the city.

That is due not alone to our distances but to the share of land publicly owned within the borders of each of the 11 Western States.

Federal and Indian land ownership in Arizona account for 69 percent of its total land area. The Federal Government owns 44.6 percent, or 32,414,635 acres, of the State's total area of 72,688,200 acres. In addition there are 19,344,971 acres of Indian land. None of this acreage is on the tax roll. If Uncle Sam did not help to build roads in Arizona, the task with modern transportation standards would be impossible.

In Nevada, the total area is 70,264,960 acres. The Federal Government owns 61,644,005 acres, or approximately 87.7 percent of the total land area. In addition to this, there are 1,149,700 acres of Indian lands not on the tax roll.

In comparison to these Western States, New York has a total land area of 30,684,160 acres. The total Federal land area is 258,519 acres, or 0.8 percent. Iowa, for instance, has a total area of 35,868,800 with the total Federal holding of 122,244, or a 0.3 percent Federal acreage.

Fortunately, the problem was recognized long ago and a man who helped develop—if he did not invent—modern policy is still Arizona's senior U.S. Senator, CARL HAYDEN. This is to be no historical survey: suffice to say that the original Shackleford proposal recognized the need to apportion Federal aid to highways on the threefold basis of population, area, and mileage of post roads. Such a bill was enacted in 1916, providing a total of \$75 million for the next 5 years. That sum, of course, was utterly inadequate and more money was pumped in.

The act itself was amended first to include a larger percentage for areas of unappropriated public lands in the public land States and then by Senator HAYDEN to consider as well untaxed Indian lands. That raised the Federal participation in Arizona from a 50-50 basis to a 72-28 basis, and it helped New Mexico and other States as well.

That was primary Federal aid. In the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934, aid to secondary roads was specifically earmarked. More recently we have moved into the more publicized Interstate Highway program where Senator GORE prepared a liberal bill and reported it from the Senate Public Works Committee of which the senior Senator from my State, DENNIS CHAVEZ, is chairman. So the West continues its interest in roads and its reliance on the Federal Government for a large share of funds to do the needed work.

I am sure that you have already heard—or will hear from succeeding speakers—all you want to know about roads, but it seems appropriate to suggest that the rising tide of population plus the factor of more rapid growth in the Western States may make all our present plans and standards inadequate.

We have learned that lesson in our American cities. In 1850 only 15 percent of our population lived in our metropolitan areas; but 65 percent lived there by 1950, and that is where most of our future growth will take place. I have mentioned what it meant to housing in Los Angeles, but there isn't a city in the fast-growing West that will not feel the pinch in its transportation problems.

Who knows what road system you will need through and around your cities? Will you be forced to cut off from traffic the heart of your cities? Or can you plan now to make them usable?

Fort Worth has a plan. It now has a population of about half a million, but expects to double that by 1970. What to do? Someone had an idea.

The Fort Worth plan would set aside 15 city blocks for central shopping and install there stores, shops, banks, restaurants, and theaters. There wouldn't be a single car or truck on the surface of that area. Giant parking garages would be developed at lower levels and moving stairways would bring shoppers to the surface. The idea seems to be to keep cars and trucks out so that people may come in.

Have you an idea for your metropolis? Last week a Texas multimillionaire who had just made a big investment in the future of Albuquerque predicted that that city's present population of around 200,000 would reach 2 million by the year 1970.

Can you imagine a population of that order of magnitude in my home town? Can you dream up a plan to serve downtown Albuquerque in that day and generation? Can you foresee the strain on such narrow streets as Copper, Gold, Silver, and Lead, whose very names remind us of our almost-forgotten mining history? I say it will be a problem to convert the traffic lanes of the old cowtown to the freeways of a metropolitan area of even a half million people, and it can only be done with the help of the Federal Government. We simply cannot find money fast enough to match the growth that we know is ahead. The task of finding it is upon the 86th and succeeding Congresses.

And the school problem is like unto that, where the Government owns large tracts of land but moves in huge numbers of people whose families include children of school age, the problem is now greater than the community can bear. Hence the Congress responded to the situation by passing in 1951 Public Law 815 to provide assistance in construction of facilities in these areas and Public Law 874 to pay part of the operating expenses—laws which have been extended from time to time and are now effective until 1962.

Between 1951 and 1958 under Public Law 815, 24 school districts in New Mexico received \$26,720,587. In all, 98 building projects were finished containing 986 classrooms for 27,608 children. During the same years, Arizona received \$21,886,553. Nationwide for this fiscal year \$50 million is to be spent for school construction and \$150 million for maintenance and operation of schools in impacted areas under these laws—and there is still need for vast additional sums for Federal aid to education. Senators and Representatives must try to do this badly needed job in the 86th Congress. But that fight is always a tough one. What will we do when the tidal wave of population finally reaches us?

Schools, roads, and then houses. In Los Angeles County alone building permits issued have exceeded a billion dollars a year since 1950. But the new homes create a long list of necessities—shopping centers, office buildings, drive-in banks, doctors' offices, golf courses and other recreational facilities. The trucking business is bound to be good with all the materials that the new cities will require.

Congress keeps on responding: a highway act for roads, aid to education to provide and maintain schools, housing and home finance for new residences, airport assistance so we can travel and land at jet age speeds, and Hill-Burton money to build hospitals when we become ill. No field of expanded endeavor seems able to keep with the pace unless it has aid from the Central Government.

Most of the new projects require water—as do our new habits of living. Recently an eastern newspaper carried a picture of a southwestern residence development with a swimming pool behind every home. That's a new demand for water and it is growing fast. Air conditioning is another claimant. That is why the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of Congress have before them so many bills which include domestic water supplies, such as the Arkansas-Fryingpan project of Colorado. Water may be the most difficult to supply of all the new needs of the growing West.

So you might be interested to know that about 10 days ago, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported out Senate Resolution 43 which contemplates an

exhaustive study of water conditions throughout the United States. We did not concern ourselves with any shortage of water that there might be in the Colorado River and thus bother with a problem that is tied into the lawsuit of *Arizona v. California* or in any way involves the claims of the lower basin States against the upper basin States in the Colorado River. We know that under present circumstances there is not enough water in the Colorado River to supply all the people who want to use it, but we also know the problem 20 years from now is to be even more formidable.

Does the 86th Congress merely fold its hands and express its regrets? Not at all. There are several rays of sunshine—and we intend to pursue them all.

First, there is the intriguing promise of atomic energy. We raise water to high temperatures when it is used as a coolant in creating electric current from uranium. We need to raise sea water to high temperatures if it is to be made free of salt. Somewhere, somehow we may learn to coordinate the two processes and obtain an abundant supply of both products.

Second, there is the general program of desalinization of salty and brackish waters, and I was happy to be the author of the bill under which the construction of five large plants can now move ahead. The first site is soon to be selected, and there a plant to remove salt from sea water will be built. It offers much to the West. It could remove from many cities the ceiling on population which limited water supplies now threaten to impose. It could in time assure expanding—almost exploding—Los Angeles an unlimited and eternal supply of good water from the Pacific Ocean. Such a realization might remove California from the more active candidates for water from the Colorado River, could then assure a pleasing outcome of the suit between Arizona and California, and as a final byproduct, let Arizona, California, and Nevada tell the upper Colorado River Basin States that the days of fighting over the water of that river might someday be at an end.

Third, there is the possibility of weather control through the seeding of clouds. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER has been a leader in the current program to establish a cloud-seeding project that might add a million acre-feet of water to the Colorado River, and thereby relieve the shortage in the flow of the river below the estimates upon which the Colorado River compact was based.

Considerable quantities of water are still available in the West to meet its needs for several years to come. However, there may be a rearrangement of priorities now assigned to water use.

Edward A. Ackerman, a scientist and water authority attached to the Carnegie Institution in Washington, in January delivered a paper to a symposium on cloud modification and water resources. In it, he wrote:

"Past western irrigation development usually was undertaken in the absence of other seriously competing demands for water \* \* \* there are signs that this situation is changing."

Mr. Ackerman concludes that there are population and industrial demands upon the West's water supply which may reduce the priority of development of water for irrigation. Domestic and industrial uses may become first and second priorities, and irrigation may be third.

However, the 86th Congress again must move ahead with weather control, with money for the desalinization plants, including one for the arid region of the Southwest, with funds for the Atomic Energy Commission which has already had a "feeler" from California on a possible test plant to combine salinity control with electric power, with approval of projects like the San Luis

Dam which ultimately might add substantially to the water supply of southern California cities. This is truly the subject of my talk, "Business and the 86th Congress," because business is dependent for its development and continued growth on the availability of funds and programs that mean new homes, schools, roads, hospitals, airports and an adequate supply of water.

As a closing word, may I suggest that the ability of Congress to meet and solve these problems may be somewhat dependent on business itself. Many groups associate themselves with political endeavor. Business, in my experience, has remained a little aloof. Do you think you should? Do you deeply care who goes to Washington? Do you get pleasure or pain when you see and visit with the man you have helped send to the Senate or the House?

Businessmen can worry less about the tasks of the 86th and succeeding Congress, when—if I may steal a business slogan from my greeting card friend Joyce Hall—"When you care enough to send the very best."

### DAV Services in Virginia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Virginia citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veterans' organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Virginia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

#### DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at the DAV National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters,

located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veterans' organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

#### DAV SERVICES IN VIRGINIA

The DAV maintains a fulltime national service officer in Virginia. He is Mr. Richard Frazee and his office is located in the VA Regional Office, 211 West Campbell Avenue, Roanoke. The department commander is Charles M. Nightingale, 4301 South Eighth Street, Arlington, and the department adjutant is Arnold H. Sells, 819 South Irving Street, Arlington.

There are three VA hospitals in Virginia in each of which the DAV has a nationally authorized VA voluntary service representative. They are as follows: Dr. Peter Leginus at the 2,000 bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Roanoke; Mr. Garland H. Branch of Ellerson, Va., at the 1,100 bed general and medical hospital at Richmond; and, Mr. Tyler Hatchell of Portsmouth, Va., at the 2,225 bed VA center at Kecoughtan.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$95,396,000 for its veteran program in Virginia, including \$24,270,430 disability compensation to its 26,687 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Virginia furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 8 percent, 1,935, are members of the 36 DAV chapters in Virginia.

#### SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE DAV

This 8 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Virginia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated) .....	40,793
Claims folders reviewed .....	33,994
Appearances before rating boards .....	15,671
Compensation increases obtained .....	1,894
Service connections obtained .....	694
Nonservice pensions .....	457
Death benefits obtained .....	69
Total monetary benefits obtained .....	\$984,997.17

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office they handled 58,282 re-

views and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Virginia veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

#### SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, etc. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, re-entensions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits, provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claims may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer, will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, Regulations and Schedule of Disability Ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage

of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

#### LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that under the overall review of claims, inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others, at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28 million per year. About 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Virginia with a consequent loss of about \$28,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudication will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Virginia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent and expert national service officer.

#### COST OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

#### METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income of its Identio-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously made a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identio-Tag department, 6,571 of whom during the last 8 years were Virginia residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

#### MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having thus been nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation to which it recently added another \$100. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$4 per DAV member—an excellent objective for all other States. Benefactors from 29 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earnings from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its National Service Officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Virginia. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Virginia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of

America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV. I consider it a privilege and an honor to belong to the Disabled American Veterans.

### Community Enterprise at Grassroots Builds Portland, Oreg., Zoo Railway

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us in the Federal Government are continually encouraging action at the grassroots level to combat juvenile delinquency, to provide healthful recreation, and to stimulate interest in scientific and technical developments.

All three of these goals have been attained by my home community of Portland, Oreg., in its construction and expansion of the Portland Zoo Railway, which will be the most elaborate and farflung recreation railroad ever built in our land.

The city government, business firms, labor unions, schools, and civic organizations all have cooperated to launch this undertaking. In addition, some 20,000 local people have purchased shares of stock in the enterprise; many of these are children, making an investment for the first time in their lives.

Business Week magazine for March 28, 1959, has published a most comprehensive and thorough description of the history of the Portland Zoo Railway. Furthermore, I myself wrote an article about this extraordinary project for the issue of Railway Progress magazine of January 1958, under the title "Portland Builds a Railroad." The Business Week article is entitled "A Railroad So Popular It Must Expand."

Indeed, expansion has occurred even since the Business Week article was printed. The vast Weyerhaeuser Timber Corp. has agreed to build a fire train for the Portland Zoo Railroad system, which traverses magnificent stands of fir and cedar forests. The Portland Trust Bank has loaned \$20,000 to the Portland Zoological Society for enlargement of the railway, and no security was demanded. Charles Francis Adams, president of the bank, has described the action as welcome because his institution desires loans which are good for the customer, good for the community and good for the bank. A loan to the Zoo Railway is in that category.

The 104th Infantry Division, of the U.S. Army Reserves, has agreed to construct two-thirds of a mile of track for the Zoo Railway at the Oregon Centennial Exhibition and Trade Fairgrounds, for this is a prime feature of our State's 100th year. The commander of the divi-

sion, Brig. Gen. Eugene Cushing, will bring 200 men to tackle the job as a training exercise. General Cushing is arranging for division chaplains to conduct Catholic and Protestant services to be held at the centennial rail track site Sunday, April 19.

Advising and assisting the soldiers in the track laying will be executives of the railroads serving Portland: The Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, Great Northern, Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway, Northern Pacific Terminal Co., and Portland Traction Co. These rail men will be led by John H. Jones, manager of the Northern Pacific Terminal and president of the Portland Zoo Railway.

Assisting also will be members of the Construction and General Laborers' Union, Local 320, and the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way, AFL-CIO.

Approximately 3,000 crossties have been donated to the Portland Zoo Railway by the Templeton Lumber Co. of Portland, of which Herbert A. Templeton is the president and moving spirit. This was arranged by Bert Thomas, vice president of the Valsetz Lumber Co., a division of the Templeton lumber holdings. They will be loaded in freight cars and hauled without charge to Independence, Oreg. From that point the Portland Zoo Railway will bring them to Portland.

The Oregon Building Congress, a group of contractors, suppliers, labor leaders, architects, engineers, and others interested in the building industry have voted to join with the Portland Zoo Railway in designing and building a 250-foot trestle bridge over a scenic ravine north of the new bear grottoes. This bridge, supported by two large wood arches, will be 40 feet above a series of pools housing waterfowl. The bridge will provide a truly beautiful and spectacular feature of the Portland Zoo Railway route. Completion of the bridge, a part of the Washington Park line, is slated for August 1, 1959.

I have cited all these accomplishments and donations, Mr. President, because they demonstrate what can be attained at the local level by public-spirited people, whether they are in industry and management or in the ranks of trade unions and organized labor.

So that a record may be compiled of the unselfish and altruistic community interest in the Portland Zoo Railway, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article published in Business Week of March 28, 1959, on this unique project and my own article published approximately 1 year earlier in the pages of Railway Progress on the same general subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Mar. 28, 1959]

#### A RAILROAD SO POPULAR IT MUST EXPAND

From the Aberdeen & Rockfish to the Zug Island Road, it takes 14 columns of fine print to index all the transportation lines whose vital statistics appear in the fat monthly Official Guide of the Railways. Nowhere in the list, though, is the Portland Zoo Railway, despite the fact that in the Portland, Oreg., union station, its emblem enjoys equal prom-

inence with those of the five major railroads serving the city.

The Zooline, a strikingly uncommon carrier that's an exception to almost every contemporary railroad rule, currently traverses half a mile of realistic 30-inch gage track in the new municipal zoo at Portland. More roadbed and rolling stock are soon to come.

#### OPPOSITES

It sounds slightly Lilliputian, yet in its own small way the Zooline represents an achievement to make the harried brass of the class I roads take note.

While most railroads are disconsolately dropping runs or ripping up track altogether, the Zooline is aggressively laying new iron and ordering new equipment, to add to a system that first went into operation only last June.

Against an earnings picture of the most unmitigated gloom on the grownup roads, the Zooline figured 1958 revenues at \$9.70 a mile, though its accounting procedures might not pass muster with an ICC auditor.

While more and more of the rails advertise "freight service only," the Portland Zooline is designed exclusively for the delight of passengers.

#### PITCHING IN

The effort that went into creating Portland's Zoo Railway had all the community participation of an oldtime small town quilting bee, though Portland, at 404,000 population within the city limits alone, is far out of the quilting bee class. Businessmen donated cash and time, industrialists contributed facilities and manpower, and ordinary citizens even doubled as "gandy dancers" to pound spikes and set rails.

The same spirit is continuing as the line expands and as it ties in with next summer's celebration of the Oregon Centennial, the 100th anniversary of statehood.

#### HOW IT BEGAN

At the outset, the railroad was only an incidental feature of the plans for Portland's new zoo, for which the city's voters approved a \$4 million bond issue in May 1954. The new zoo was to replace a cramped, moth-eaten layout, and mainly because the sponsoring Portland Zoological Society included one or two rail buffs, the budget included \$25,000 for a recreational railroad.

From the beginning, perhaps the prime mover has been 53-year-old Edward M. Miller, assistant managing editor of the Oregonian, Portland daily, and a quietly ardent aficionado of the rails.

Miller's first step was to arrange a study of recreational railroads in operation all around the country—from Seattle to Spartanburg, S.C., Sunbury, Pa., and St. Louis. The findings: Most lines were both popular and profitable especially those elaborate enough to appeal to adults as well as children.

#### WIDENING PLANS

This report contributed to the decision that a \$25,000 toy train such as usually featured in zoos just wouldn't do for Portland. Anyway, Miller and cronies felt a bigger layout would be more suitable for the hilly, fir-studded terrain on which the zoo was to be built.

About this time, Miller cautioned the zoo architects that eventually they would be designing the zoo to fit the railroad, rather than vice versa. "They laughed when we first warned them about that," recalls Miller, "but they soon stopped."

#### BABY AEROTRAIN

After a design competition among Portland architects and engineering firms, rail planners selected a proposal from Northwest Marine Iron Works, a maker of sawmill and heavy machinery and heavy marine engines. Northwest Marine's staff included a mechanical engineer, John Flaschner, with experi-

ence in rail equipment manufacturing in his native Hungary. Flaschner worked up drawings for train roughly half the size of an ordinary passenger train, to run on 30-inch-gage track (standard gage: 56½ in.).

The diesel locomotive was a scaled-down version of General Motors' experimental Aerotrains, and it was to trail four passenger cars topped with clear plastic for unobstructed views. Inside, there would be room for 99 adults or 132 children.

To go along with the train, the zoo architects shuffled bear pits and monkey houses to provide room ultimately for 6,460 feet of right-of-way through the grounds, with tunnels, trestles, stations, a shop, and sidings. All told, train and track, the system would cost \$280,000.

#### HELP WANTED

Northwest Marine agreed to build the train at cost, and a Portland fabricator, Hirschberger Sheet Metal Co., went to work making the locomotive and car bodies.

It was an ambitious program, considering that originally only \$25,000 had been allocated for the Zooline. But Miller and Stewart H. Holbrook, Portland author, already had a plan. Forming the Portland Zoo Railway Co., they invited brass of regional railroads to lunch and made their pitch. "Railroads are becoming more and more a legend in the popular mind, less and less a living reality," said Miller. "Why not help us build in Portland a recreational railroad for children which they will never forget?"

Railroad executives are traditionally conservative, but the Portland group was moved by Miller's plea. To work with the Zooline, they tapped Jack H. Jones, manager of Northern Pacific Terminal Co., jointly owned by Northern Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Union Pacific, which runs Portland's passenger station and surrounding yards.

#### MAN OF ACTION

Jones took over as president of the Zoo Railway. At the time, there was doubt whether the initial stretch of track—half a mile with loops at each end, to make a one-half ride—could be finished in time for the proposed opening in June 1958.

The Terminal Co. shops turned out two 30-inch-gage cars for a work train. Miller and Jones found a 30-inch-gage diesel logging engine rusting in the yard of Portland Machinery Co. With a new cab and a coat of red paint, the diesel became "Casey Pioneer" and started hauling the work train.

Then Jones organized "Gandy Dancer Day," with hundreds of Portlanders volunteering to help lay track. The pace still wasn't fast enough; so crews of real-life gandy dancers quietly appeared.

Jones also recruited other railroad brass to the Zooline. Frank Landsburg, an ICC inspector, became safety director—and, thanks to his official Government inspection, brought a big reduction in liability insurance rates. Other volunteer executives flocked to the Zooline from the Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, Great Northern, and Spokane, Portland & Seattle.

#### MORE TRACK

No sooner was the Zooliner first in operation than attention turned to an extension through virgin timber along steep slopes, with spectacular views, to the city's Washington Park, which adjoins the new zoo tract. There wasn't any money to pay for it, but the Southern Pacific donated 40 engineering man-days to map a route. Then the Spokane, Portland & Seattle provided a detailed engineering study worth \$5,000. James Yost, Inc., general contractors, volunteered to do the work for just the cost of labor.

To begin meeting Yost's weekly payroll, the Zooline started issuing stock—at \$1 a share, offering as dividend two free rides

when the extension was complete. Bar-tenders in all of Portland's taverns wore engineer's caps and peddled the stock to patrons; schoolchildren canvassed neighborhoods.

#### FREE BALLAST

The Cinder Hill Co., of Prineville, Oreg., gave 2,500 yards of ballast, which the railroads hauled to Portland free in cars loaded by Prineville and neighboring Redmond children. In return, every youngster in grade schools of the two cities got a free share of Zooline stock.

With all this help the Zooline finished the right-of-way and laid almost 3,700 feet of track on the extension before winter rains halted work.

#### CENTENNIAL TRAIN

The next scheme was a train for the 100-day Oregon Centennial next summer. At the celebration it would bring revenue to the Zooline; later, the rolling stock could be used on the Washington Park route.

For this train, George Burton, a service-repair supervisor in a Portland radio, TV, and music store and a leader of rail-fan groups, is building a replica of a classic old steam locomotive from authentic drawings. Fellow rail buffs are helping in the labor, and all of Portland's foundries are contributing parts. Five cars similar to those on the first Zooliner are under construction at Northwest Marine Iron Works and Hirschberger.

To cope with an expected flood of passengers, the Zooline plans to put still another train on its home track by summer—this one built around the Casey Pioneer work locomotive. Hirschberger is doing the job for \$6,000—"cash when he catches us," says Miller.

#### BONANZA

Miller is still sketchy about where all the money will come from, but he exudes confidence nonetheless—as well he might, from the results of the original Zooliner's first 80 days of operation last summer.

The figures are such as few professional railroaders ever see: in 80 days 107,000 paying passengers and a net profit of \$5.61 per mile on revenues of \$21,339. Even though this doesn't take into account capital costs, depreciation, or all the free services, it still gives the Zooline every reason to believe its passenger business is here to stay.

[From Railway Progress, January 1958]

#### PORTLAND BUILDS A RAILROAD

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

In his recent autobiography, Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to Presidents, has told how the sight of expresses and fast freights high-balling through his native Camden, S.C., invariably instilled in him a youthful desire to be the owner of the Southern Railway.

My own boyhood ambitions followed a more modest scale. Watching Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Great Northern Mallets coping with our rugged Oregon mountain grades, I decided that sometime I might qualify to be a brakeman, conductor, or even an engineer.

These yearnings, alas, always remained unrequited. For one reason or another, I never became a railroader. Now, however, there is to be some belated measure of compensation. At the ripe old age of 44, I have been invited to serve on the board of directors of a railroad. Even though it is of only 30-inch gage, the blare of air horns thrills in my ears and the smell of diesel fumes twitches my nostrils. Despite the railroad's projected total length of a mere 2½ miles, I already feel the earth quivering to the rumble of its locomotives. Perhaps the personal satisfaction is so great because this railroad will carry the most precious cargo of all—children.

My home city of Portland, Oreg., where I was born and raised, is undertaking to build and operate the most elaborate and pictur-

esque home-sized railroad yet planned anywhere in the United States. It will be part of a brand-new zoo in the city's fir-mantled hills, so our system is officially known as the Portland Zoo Railway Co.

No railroad, large or small, was ever more of a community project. Leading citizens are raising funds for its completion. Railroad management and labor in the Portland area are contributing both work and materials, as well as general operating wisdom and know-how. Manufacturing firms are producing the motive power and rolling stock at cost. This spontaneous voluntary effort has been necessary because Portland, a city of 400,000 residents, is constructing a zoo rail route far more elaborate than that ever attempted by metropolitan centers with 10 or 12 times Portland's population.

To begin with, the 30-inch gage is no toy. Railway Progress has reported that jungle products of India and Ceylon are hauled on some 2,000 miles of actual operating railroads of this slender width. Furthermore, the 2½ miles of Portland Zoo trackage, while no threat to the Pennsylvania or Santa Fe in length, will actually outdistance the only other two major recreational systems in the country which might be considered its rivals—Disneyland, near Los Angeles, and the Detroit Zoo railroad.

The first stage of the Portland Zoo Railway is now nearing completion. This is 1¼ miles of track looping around the new zoo, plus a sweep to be added through primitive forests of conifer trees and up the ramparts of a wooded canyon. As income is collected at the ticket office, another 1¼ miles will be thrust into the most densely timbered solitudes which stockade the city limits of any community in the United States.

The train penetrating these scenic surroundings will be of substantial proportions. The locomotive, patterned generally after General Motors' Aerotrains, will haul three streamlined coaches and a club car in which soft drinks and ice cream can be served. Each car will have a capacity of 24 adults or 32 children. Length of the entire train will be 112 feet, 9 inches. The 24-foot locomotive will weigh 12,000 pounds and develop 140 horsepower. It will be held by a governor to a maximum speed of 15 miles an hour, because some of the track will go over high viaducts or along the sides of steep ravines. Dead-man controls will bring the train to an automatic stop in the event of sudden emergencies.

Perhaps because children all over the State of Oregon are thrilled with the prospective completion of their railroad, high-priced talent has been put at the disposal of the Portland Zoo Railway Co. on either a volunteer or at-cost basis.

Certain unusual aspects of this extraordinary little railroad have required that the train be built locally. Portland's damp climate, refreshed with rainstorms from the Aleutians, called for cars with glass roofs of the vista-dome variety rather than the open-type coaches in vogue at California's sunny amusement parks. The spectacular but hazardous right-of-way dictated a gage wide enough to eliminate dangerous spills. Interviews with small fry ruled out locomotives which looked like steamers. "We want diesel streamliners," said they and it was evident from their tones that anything less would have an adverse influence upon patronage.

So the zoo train is being constructed in Portland, according to these and other special stipulations. An iron works and a sheet-metal company are combining to handle the job on a nonprofit basis. Cost to the zoo fund will be approximately \$60,000. If the train were manufactured by Northwest Marine Iron Works and Hirschberger Sheet Metal along conventional fiscal lines, the expenditure would amount to at least \$100,000. Locomotive and cars have been designed by a rail enthusiast named John

Flaschner, who fled to America from the tyrants and barbarians invading his native Hungary. In Budapest he had worked as an engineer for a firm building trains for the export market. Rolling stock which took shape on Flaschner's drafting board is still in service on South American and African railroad lines.

With such men as Flaschner placing their talents at the disposal of the little zoo railroad, help began to come from other sources. L. R. Smith, Portland superintendent of the Southern Pacific's extensive operations in Oregon, put one of his regular survey crews to work locating the right of way for the extension through the stately forests surrounding the zoo. This spared the fund of the children's railroad at least \$1,500. A manufacturing firm in distant Los Angeles agreed to fabricate the switch frogs for the entire system without any payment at all, which represented a saving of \$1,000. Bricklayers from the building trades unions put trowel and mortar to thousands of bricks at the zoo while foregoing their wages, and much of the building material was presented as a gift by local suppliers.

Two men have been principally responsible for organizing this kind of participation. One is J. H. (Jack) Jones, manager of the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., who serves as president of the Zoo Railway. The other is Edward M. Miller, assistant managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, the newspaper which recently won a Pulitzer prize for exposing alleged criminal elements in certain labor unions. Miller, one of the mayor's civic appointees to the Portland Zoo Commission, is a zealous railfan who would rather travel by train than via Cinderella's coach-and-four. Before the first bulldozer ever had cleared ground for a bear pit or tiger grotto, he decided that the majestic terrain was ideal for America's finest recreation railway. To make this possible in spite of the limited population and financial resources of the community, Miller had to enlist an immense quantity of volunteer skills and equipment.

The newspaper executive rallied to his cause Jack Jones and other local railroaders by stressing one theme consistently. "Look," Miller would tell them, "fewer people every year have direct contact with railroads, as travel by airplane and private automobile increases. This means railroads are becoming more and more of a legend in the popular mind, less and less a living reality. Yet trains have great dramatic impact on people. Why not help us build in Portland a recreational railroad for children which they will never forget? It not only will have a profound effect in our own State of Oregon, which is an important source of raw materials to be hauled eastward, but its fame will radiate throughout the land. And the children thus thrilled and entertained will some day be the shippers of this country's freight. \* \* \*

"I decided Ed Miller was about 200 percent right," said Jack Jones, "and that's why I agreed to become president of the Zoo Railway. I also decided that, if I were the head of a big system myself, I would endow children's lines in zoos and parks all over the United States, with the colors and emblems of my own particular system very much in evidence. What better way to make an impression on the next generation of Americans?"

As head of the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., Jones would have to feature a chameleon's multiple colors to please all his bosses. The system, which operates 100 miles of track in or near Portland's Union Station, is owned jointly by the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Northern Pacific Railroads. When the Portland Zoo picked up \$4,000 at the Oregon State Fair in Salem with an exhibition, Jones provided one of his railroad-section gang crews to erect and dismantle

the zoo's tents. He also persuaded the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway to haul to the fair the first car fabricated for the zoo train.

Another railroad celebrity whom Ed Miller has recruited for the forested zoo system is Stewart H. Holbrook, the noted Oregon author who specializes in books about Americans and American folklore. One of his most heralded volumes, "The Story of American Railroads," has been a persistent seller ever since it was first published in 1946. Holbrook, who will be chairman of the board of the railroad, contemplates an imposing list of officials, ranging from general superintendent to chief of redcaps. These will stem predominantly from the ranks of railway management and labor in Oregon.

Although all of these individuals long ago grew to manhood, they are deriving great nostalgia at present from seeking a name for the zoo train and an official medallion for the zoo railroad. Designer Flaschner favors Bluebird for the domeliner which will swoop through the fir glades. The first medallion featured a jolly elephant in an engineer's visored cap. This drew some frowns from the Democrats on the board of directors, so a frolicking Bengal tiger was substituted instead. "Anyway," rationalized one of the Democrats defensively, "tigers are cousins of cougars, which are indigenous to Oregon, while elephants don't have a solitary kin among the wildlife of our State."

On June 1, 1958, the most lovingly-created zoo train ever to operate in America will make the inaugural pilgrimage over a recreational route without scenic counterpart anywhere in our Nation. Youthful passengers in the club car of the Bluebird will order their first root beers and Eskimo pies. Some lucky youngster will ride the fireman's strategic seat—at an extra cost of \$1 from dad's wallet. Small young faces will dot the glass-enclosed vistadomes as the hillsides and evergreens fleet past.

But the real fun will be enjoyed by all of us adults who watch proudly from the station platform.

## Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Death of George Frederick Handel

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, German contribution to modern civilization has been great, and innumerable Germans have added immensely to what is commonly called Western civilization. Germans have been particularly outstanding in the sciences, but no less distinguished have they been in the arts, especially in music. And Handel is one of the giants in the world of music.

George Frederick Handel, who died exactly 200 years ago at the ripe age of 74, was the son of a barber-surgeon in Halle, Lower Saxony, who by his unusual talents and through ceaseless industry gained immortal renown as a composer. At the age of 20 he produced his first opera, "Almira," one of a series of great operas culminating in the "Messiah" and "Israel in Egypt" which together have long placed him among the foremost of great composers of his time. Even today he is considered one of the greatest composers of all time.

The celebration of the 200th anniversary of Handel's death evokes many memories, and recalls historic events in German history, but we can hardly forget the importance of current international events connected with Germany. Indeed, the Berlin situation, the even larger issue of German unification, and the matter of strengthening the Western democracies in their fight against Soviet totalitarianism, are issues that the West cannot hope to solve without the wholehearted cooperation of the German people. On this 200th anniversary of Handel's death let us preserve the freedom of West Berlin in a manner demonstrated by President Truman in 1948-49, let us work for a united, free, and democratic Germany, and let us work for closer cooperation among all freedom-loving peoples of Western democracies.

## Steps Toward World Order

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the subject "Steps Toward World Order," delivered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] before the University of Virginia Law School, at Charlottesville, Va., on March 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STEPS TOWARD WORLD ORDER

(Speech by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the University of Virginia Law School, Charlottesville, Va., March 12, 1959)

In these dark times when crisis is piled upon crisis, it is easy to lose heart, to give up hope. The Berlin crisis is bristling with complex and knotty problems. It is perhaps the most serious situation we have faced since V-J Day. The Formosan crisis has quieted down, but has not disappeared. And there is always a crisis of one kind or another in the turbulent Middle East.

With every crisis there are dangers and risks. But there are also opportunities and responsibilities. I have not lost hope for a more enduring peace, and I believe the American people have not lost hope. We must keep hope alive. Genuine hope. Not hope based upon wishful thinking, but tempered with a realistic understanding of the world we live in.

A few months ago I was in Moscow and Berlin. It was an unforgettable experience. I have a firsthand knowledge of some of the vexing problems we face. But I have not surrendered the gift of hope which gives men the courage to press on, the vision to see beyond the encircling gloom a better world.

Genuine hope does not permit us to escape the present into some utopian future of our dreams. Genuine hope helps us to come to grips with the present in the name of the future and out of respect for the values of the past. Evil triumphs when good men fail to act.

Tonight I want to talk about some steps we can take toward greater peace and order in the world. I say steps, plural, not one giant step. This may disappoint some of you, but I am convinced that new institutions and laws are not achieved in one giant step. Great preparation and even suffering precedes the birth of new forms, new ways of doing things. History teaches not to expect drastic changes overnight.

The pace of history does not discourage me. If the goal is clear and if we take genuine steps in the right direction, I am confident that our efforts will be rewarded.

The many-faceted challenge of communism today demands bold action to meet the economic, political, and military threat of the Soviet Union and Red China. Only bold steps will be equal to the challenge of the "revolution of rising expectations" in Asia and Africa. Timidity is the counsel of despair.

#### THE HUNDRED YEARS OF PEACE: 1815-1914

Before I suggest some specific steps toward greater world order, I would like to say a word about a remarkable period of modern history, a period which may hold some lessons for us today. I refer to the century spanned by the end of the War of 1812 to the outbreak of World War I, which some historians have referred to as "the hundred years of peace." More accurately, it was a century when there were no general wars and a considerable degree of world order prevailed. The balance of power among the European states made a measure of stability possible. No single European power could aspire to world domination. Great Britain, with its firm control of the seas, acted as a check on the ambitions of any of the European landpowers.

England was neither strong enough, nor did she aspire to dominate the European continent. She acted as a balance wheel. Through this delicate balance stability was maintained for an entire century.

On the economic side, this century of peace was a great period of industrial development in many parts of the world. International trade was stimulated by the acceptance of the gold standard. And the London capital market provided the funds through which large portions of the world, including these United States, were developed.

The principles of Anglo-Saxon law and political institutions, based upon the concept of public responsibility, spread to the far corners of the earth. Everywhere people were beginning to learn, at least theoretically, the meaning of the democratic principle of government by the consent of the governed.

During this remarkable century wars were limited both geographically and in their political objectives. In this century we had a tragic Civil War. But there was no general war. And no tyrant rose to conquer the world or even any large portion of it.

World War I shattered the hundred years of peace and economic development, and destroyed the fragile and elementary forms of world order created in the 19th century. This order was never really reestablished in the long weekend between Versailles and Pearl Harbor.

What can we learn from this century of peace? Is it too different from our present century to teach us anything? Our times are different, in some ways vastly different. Yet, I believe there are three very important things we can learn from the 100 years of peace:

1. Power must be exercised with responsibility.
2. Peace is possible.
3. Peace must be planned.

First, power must be exercised with responsibility. The key to the 100 years of stability was the responsible exercise of British power. Britain held the balance in Europe and through her navy throughout

the world. She carried her power with restraint and with a sense of moral responsibility. She did not seek to enslave or to make the world over in her image. I am not suggesting that her Britannic Majesty was a paragon of virtue, but I am suggesting that Great Britain exercised her decisive power with wisdom and restraint.

The mantle of world leadership which Britain wore in the 19th century has in this century fallen upon our shoulders. The key to peace and order in our century, insofar as we have control over the situation, is the wise and responsible exercise of U.S. power. I am not suggesting for a moment a new imperialism, and American century, but rather a recognition that we should have a sense of responsibility commensurate with our wealth and power. This responsibility, in our interdependent world, must be widely shared, through instruments such as the United Nations, NATO, and other multilateral arrangements in the political, economic, and military spheres.

The destiny of Western civilization and the peace of the world may well depend upon America's ability to use her wealth and power not only to defend herself, but to create a world of greater peace and justice for all men.

Second, we must believe that peace is possible. If we believe that peace is not possible, we would be among the most miserable of men. Although we are today challenged by a powerful, committed, and relentless foe and the specter of nuclear destruction hangs menacingly over our heads, I still believe we can avoid war and that peace is possible. I have worked and I will continue to work on this belief.

Third, peace must be planned, worked for, sacrificed for. Peace is not an accident, a gift from the gods or a happenstance. Peace is a difficult goal, an elusive goal. Peace must be waged. We must work for peace even as we keep up our defensive shield. Waging peace is no substitute for an adequate defense posture. Nor is an adequate defense posture a substitute for waging peace. The world of 1959 does not confer upon us the luxury of choosing between waging peace and maintaining our defensive strength. We must do both, and we must do each task with as much imagination, creativity and wisdom as we can muster.

#### THREE STEPS WE CAN TAKE NOW

There is no magic key—no easy way—to world order, no master plan that will assure us of peace in our time. Perhaps I should amend this statement by saying there is no master plan which lies within the realm of the politically possible. Bismarck once said that "politics is the art of the possible." He was right, although there is room for disagreement on what is in fact possible. You will recall that in one of the Federalist Papers, the writer (I believe it was Madison) said that if all men were angels, then we would not need the checks and balances which the Founding Fathers regarded as essential to sound government. But since men are men and not angels, said Madison, we need the checks and balances which prevent one interest or one branch of government from taking over.

Given a world of imperfect men and nations, I maintain there is no master plan that will end conflicts of interest and erase all hostility. Nevertheless, there are steps, important steps we can take which will move us along on the path to a more secure and peaceful world. These steps will help to accomplish in this century the stability and order which was achieved in the 19th century.

Some of the greatest opportunities lie in the economic realm, especially in the areas of international trade and economic development. We need present-day counterparts to the gold standard which facilitated trade

and the London capital market which provided development funds in many areas throughout the world. The International Monetary Fund and GATT (the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) are in a real sense the counterpart to the gold standard. The International Bank for Reconstruction (World Bank), the point 4 program, the Colombo plan, and other similar instruments are the counterpart to the London capital market.

In the military sphere NATO and other free world alliances are the counterpart to the balance achieved by British naval power.

I merely mention the economic and military aspects in passing.

I thought I would like to confine my remarks to the political sphere. In the political sphere we can take three positive steps:

1. Work for effective arms control with inspection.
2. Strengthen the United Nations and world law.
3. Make fuller use of the World Court.

1. Work for effective arms control with inspection: Peace and a more stable world order can scarcely be attained if nations are constantly developing postures of hostility toward each other. Demands by one great power that another great power surrender some valuable position, loud and repeated threats of annihilation if demands are not met, all backed up by a feverish race to construct new weapons and amass them in ever growing stockpiles—these developments do not create an atmosphere conducive to a more just and peaceful international order.

This is why steps toward disarmament now are so important to mankind's hopes for peace. We must act, even if only a small step is possible. The failure to act is to act negatively.

For years the United States and its allies planned and worked for disarmament with grandiose plans which covered the whole range of military defense and that envisaged comprehensive machinery of administration and control. We learned gradually the futility of this approach. We lowered our sights to more realistic goals, and we have now arrived at a point where we are seeking to conclude a first-stage or a partial disarmament agreement. Complete disarmament all at one stroke need not and cannot be obtained. What we should have, and must have, is a limited agreement, that will help deflect the world from its present hazardous course. Once course has been changed, there will be ample time and opportunity to pursue the larger goals toward which we aspire.

The conclusion of an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests with inspection, or to install an inspection system to prevent surprise attack in some region of the world would be a small, first-step agreement of great value for initiating a new trend in world affairs. Either one of these agreements would slow down or perhaps even halt the forward momentum of the arms race. Once the fever of competition has been lowered, sanity and reason can then operate more freely in our quest for peace with justice.

Within the past year progress has been made toward conclusion of a first-stage agreement. Negotiations for a ban on nuclear weapons tests have advanced to an extent scarcely hoped for this time a year ago.

Last summer the Soviet Union suddenly accepted our Government's invitation to hold a technical conference on devising methods of inspection in order to guarantee fulfillment of any international agreement for suspending nuclear weapons tests. This conference of scientific experts from the Communist bloc and the principal Western Powers was convened at Geneva. By the end

of last August it issued conclusions concurred in by both sides. This was an unprecedented step in the history of postwar disarmament negotiations. For the first time Soviet and Western representatives had seen eye to eye, and had agreed on the technical details of an international arms control and inspection system.

It is necessary to recognize what these Geneva conclusions were and were not. They were not in themselves an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests. They were, however, an aid, a spur, and a necessary basis for any such future agreement.

Last spring immediately after concluding a very intensive series of nuclear tests, which shot a large barrage of radioactive debris into the atmosphere encircling the globe, the U.S.S.R. announced to the world that she was unilaterally suspending nuclear weapons tests. She further announced that she would continue such a suspension provided the United States and Great Britain, the other two nuclear powers, would do the same. This was a clever maneuver, but it was not clever enough.

The primary aim of this unilateral and conditional suspension was to impress world opinion. To a degree it succeeded. But the more perceptive people around the world knew that the Soviet plan would have resulted in a suspension of tests without effective inspection. Such a suspension would have been worse than no suspension at all, because there would have been no guarantee that one side was not cheating. Under such conditions, fear, suspicion, and tension would have increased and not abated.

The United States wisely pressed ahead with its endeavor to obtain an internationally agreed termination of testing, backed up and safeguarded by an effective inspection system.

Immediately after the close of the Geneva conference of experts, the United States invited the Soviet Union to a political conference. The purpose of the second conference was to work out a test ban which would utilize the technical and scientific foundation reached at Geneva. The United States said she would suspend her tests for 1 year provided the Soviet Union would do the same. This would allow time for the political conference to hammer out an agreement.

The conclusions of the Geneva conference of experts confined themselves strictly to scientific matters of a politically nonsensitive nature. They indicated the number of inspection stations and the kinds of inspection instruments and procedures that should be adopted for an effective control system, but they did not go into such controversial matters as to where the inspection stations should be located, who should man them, or what powers the control administration should exercise. These were questions to be thrashed out at the political conference.

The Geneva political conference on suspending nuclear weapons tests has now been at work for about 4 months. When Mr. George Kennan testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament early this month, he stressed that one of the main obstacles in the way of an arms understanding with the U.S.S.R. is its philosophy and tradition of secrecy. This has been one of the main stumbling blocks on the road to any reliable arms control agreement in the postwar period, and it is one of the main obstacles to success in the current Geneva negotiations.

To be reliable, arms control inspection must be genuinely international. National self-inspection is not genuine inspection, and self-inspection is essentially what the Soviet Union has been insisting upon at Geneva. Control stations under the Geneva experts plan would be located in each participating country to check on its activities. But the Soviet has been saying, "These control stations must be manned by na-

tionals of the country wherein they are located." Communist Russians would be checking up on Communist Russians, according to this plan, and it is not difficult to see that Americans will not stake their security, or survival, on such paper promises.

The United States and Britain, in contrast, have taken the position that stations should be manned by outside nationalities, so that the resulting surveillance is truly international, mutual and reciprocal. These opposing views on inspection are responsible for the deadlock at the present moment. This is a point on which the Soviet Union must make a substantial concession if there is to be an effective and dependable inspection network.

Another crucial point of issue in the negotiations is the amount of authority that should be vested in the countries administering the control commission. The Soviet Union insists that there should be unanimity among the major powers on the control authority to make major decisions. In other words, the Soviet negotiators want a veto over the control authority. The American and British position, however, is that at least certain important decisions on the functioning of the control mechanism should not be subject to a one-nation veto, but should be reached by a majority vote.

If, for example, the inspection stations recorded an event that might be an underground nuclear test it would be necessary to send inspectors immediately to the location to investigate. "On the spot" inspection of this type is very vital to the effective functioning of the entire control system, otherwise the purpose of inspection could be frustrated and a violator of the agreement might readily escape the consequences of his violation.

The United States says, "This kind of decision cannot be blocked by a veto." The Soviet Union says, "This kind of decision must be subject to a veto, or it is a violation of sovereign rights."

Soviet intransigence is again responsible for the deadlock on this point. Unless the Moscow government modifies this position, it will be impossible to have an effective and dependable inspection system.

The issue of international inspection in the Geneva disarmament negotiations highlights one of the most significant potential contributions of disarmament to the cause of peace and harmony in the world today. If I had to single out any one factor as the main barrier to peace in the world today, I would point my finger at the Iron Curtain, or in other words the barrier of secrecy and isolation which the Soviet Union has erected between its own people and the outside world.

International inspection for suspension of nuclear weapons tests would pierce this barrier in an unprecedented way. The political effect of getting an international authority into the silent and secret land of the Soviets would be inestimable.

I am dedicated to national security. I believe our defenses should be strong in order to back up our international negotiations and commitments. We arm to parley, we develop strength in order to negotiate as well as to deter attack, limited or general.

We must arm and at the same time strive to turn back the tide of fear that is engendered by the mounting arms race. We must make a start somewhere in tearing down the veils of secrecy that breed mistrust and suspicion between the Communist and free worlds. An agreement to end nuclear weapons tests, backed up by an effectively functioning inspection system within the participating nations, would be a significant step in the direction of world peace and order.

2. Strengthen the United Nations. The United Nations is a continuing conference of over 80 sovereign states. It is a limited instrument. But it is a valuable instrument. The United Nations can be used,

abused, or ignored by its member states, and it would not be difficult to cite examples of these three attitudes toward it.

I believe the U.N. can be strengthened through a fuller use of its peacemaking and peacekeeping facilities. The member states can make a contribution to greater world order by participating in the long-range economic and humanitarian activities of the U.N. which help to weave the fabric of peace and understanding. I refer to the Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the U.N. technical assistance program, FAO, and other essentially nonpolitical activities carried on under the aegis of the world organization.

I favor the fullest possible cooperation of our Government with other nations in the great problem of assisting economically the less developed areas of the world.

In the peacekeeping or political sphere, I believe the present U.N. is capable of serving the cause of peace when the nations really want to use it. But there is no way we can force the nations to utilize the U.N. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt once said: "The United Nations is not a cure-all. It is only capable of effective action when its members have a will to make it work."

In spite of the Soviet bloc's frequent use of the veto in the Security Council and other obstructive tactics, the U.N. has a solid record of achievement even in the political sphere. Through the U.N., aggression was thrown back in Korea. Through the U.N., Soviet troops were forced to withdraw from Iran. Through the U.N., fighting was stopped in Greece, Indonesia, and the Middle East.

This suggests one possible immediate area where we can strengthen the United Nations. I refer to the U.N. emergency police force now deployed in the Gaza Strip between the United Arab Republic and Israel. This force has limited functions and no one pretends it is powerful enough to hold back a full-scale attack by either side. But it is a beginning, perhaps a symbol of a greater international force which one day may be used to bring stability in trouble areas.

It is difficult to foresee the time when a U.N. force could deal with a situation such as the present Berlin crisis in which the two superpowers are so deeply involved. This could not take place short of a radical change in the nation-state system in which states would have already surrendered their military establishments, the ultimate symbol of their sovereignty.

But, even if a U.N. police force is not capable of dealing with the major security problems in the world today, it is quite possible that a mobile force dispatched to minor trouble spots would be capable of putting out "brush fires" before they blazed into a global conflagration. This would be eminently worth the relatively small investment.

I believe we should also explore the possibility of creating international rules and machinery for the regulation of outer space. In this area the U.N. can also make a contribution.

I have no illusions. I know the U.N. can work effectively on any major security question such as arms control, or regulating outer space only when the Soviet Union is willing to go along with the majority position. And we have no means of forcing the Communist bloc to give in to the majority. But we can try, and in trying we can lay bare the intention of any nation which obstructs the plans of those nations which are genuinely working for greater order and peace. Even if the U.N. serves primarily as a mirror of our divided world, it is performing a valuable function. For without a clear picture of the world situation, we cannot act with political insight or moral wisdom.

3. We should make full use of the International Court of Justice.

One of the most disappointing aspects of the work of the United Nations has been the

International Court of Justice. This Court, established as a forum whereby international disputes would be resolved by law, has had all too little opportunity to fulfill this function. In the 13 years since it was established, the International Court of Justice has in fact decided only 10 cases. I repeat, 10 cases in 13 years.

By any standard, this is somewhat less than an impressive record of accomplishment. Here is a court made up of 15 judges who are each paid \$20,000 a year, and yet it has decided less than one case a year.

To me this is indeed tragic. For in this day and age the rule of law in international affairs should be looked upon as one of the main ways of peacefully settling disputes between nations.

The sorry record of the Court is due in large measure to the U.S. refusal to give it full backing and support. The damage was done, I regret to say, by the U.S. Senate when in 1946 it added to the so-called Morse resolution, Senate Resolution 196, which declared our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, six words "as determined by the United States."

In 1945, the United Nations Charter was approved. Chapter XIV of the charter provided for establishment of the International Court of Justice to replace the Permanent Court of International Justice. Under article 93 all members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice. However, no member nation is bound by compulsory jurisdiction of the Court without a specific declaration accepting such jurisdiction.

Less than half of the 81 member nations of the United Nations have by declaration accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in specified areas of international law stated in the statute of the Court. It is of interest to note that none of the Communist nations in the United Nations—including the Soviet Union—have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Senate Resolution 196, which gave the consent of the Senate to the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], in November of 1945; it was cosponsored by 14 other Senators from both parties.

Hearings were held on Senate Resolution 196 in July of 1946 by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Not a single witness appeared before the subcommittee to oppose the resolution. Moreover, not a single letter or telegram was received in opposition to the resolution.

Against a backdrop of overwhelming public support, the subcommittee decided to report the resolution favorably to the full Foreign Relations Committee with only one minor amendment. On July 24, 1946, by a unanimous vote, the committee reported the resolution to the Senate for favorable action in exactly the form recommended by the subcommittee.

The resolution was considered by the Senate on August 1 and 2; it was approved August 2 by a vote of 62 to 2 and the Senate adjourned sine die some 2 hours later. During consideration of the resolution three amendments were adopted.

The most controversial amendment, offered by Senator Connally, added to paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States" to the language of the resolution which excluded from cases on which compulsory jurisdiction would be accepted "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This amendment was adopted by a vote of 51 to 12.

Many observers at the time felt that this amendment, by reserving to the United States the right to decide whether or not a matter is essentially domestic, rather than

having the Court make such determination, demonstrated a lack of confidence on our part in the competence and integrity of the new Court.

Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Under Secretary of State, in testifying on this resolution expressed the argument against any such reserve clause as follows:

"The rule of law becomes effective to the extent that states agree to submit themselves to the decision of the Court in all cases involving questions of law. It cannot become effective if States may reserve this decision to themselves, regardless of the degree of good faith by which they govern their actions."

The effect of such reserve clauses has been to seriously limit the role of the International Court of Justice in settling international disputes. As I have stated, the Court has decided only 10 cases in 13 years.

I hasten to add that this sorry record is not due to any fault of the Court itself. The 15 judges are competent and qualified men. The Court is ready and willing to aid in the settlement of international disputes. The reason for the ineffectiveness of the Court lies principally in the various reservation clauses contained in the declarations of nations which have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court.

The United States, and in particular the U.S. Senate, cannot escape responsibility for the Court's ineffectiveness.

The distinguished lawyer, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and presently chairman of the Committee on World Peace Through Law of the American Bar Association, in an address delivered only this past Tuesday, March 10, assessed the blame quite candidly when he said:

"I am therefore firmly convinced that one of the major causes for the empty courtroom of the United Nations Court is the Connally reservation which was created by the U.S. Senate, is maintained by the U.S. Senate, and can be removed by the U.S. Senate. \* \* \* Every report I have seen by the many experts who have studied this situation agrees that the Connally reservation has emasculated the usefulness of the Court and rendered it impotent as an instrument for world peace. The cancerous effect of the Senate's action has spread as other nations have copied it; it has an ever-widening scope. The tremendous responsibility of the U.S. Senate for continuing through this reservation to stifle use of the United Nations Court is a most serious one when one considers the value of and need for any mechanism which can aid in preventing war under present world circumstances. The Connally reservation is unsound in principle and effect and should be eliminated."

This is a strong statement indeed. A statement of a highly respected and learned lawyer—a man not given to making reckless or rash statements. Mr. Rhyne is a sound and realistic student of international affairs, and his views cannot be casually dismissed. Mr. Rhyne's forceful address indicates a realization of the peril we face in view of the lethal weapons of mass destruction, and the absolute necessity, in the name of self-preservation, that we bolster the available means of settling disputes by law rather than force.

I believe that the time is long overdue for the Senate to remove this reserve clause in the Morse resolution. It is my intention to offer in the near future a resolution to amend the Morse resolution by deleting from paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States."

In the absence of action by the Senate, I fear that the International Court of Justice will remain an ineffective instrument of world peace without authority to dispose of disputes between nations by way of peaceful judicial determination.

It is time that we in the U.S. Senate acted to remove the shackles which restrict the United Nations Court. I hope most earnestly that prompt consideration will be given to the resolution I intend to offer.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I return to where I started. I said we must have hope, hope in certain specific small steps we can take in the direction of greater world order. I believe peace is possible, and I believe we must work for it in the small and undramatic ways—through painstaking arms control negotiations, in the day-by-day business of the United Nations, in all those daily acts of fidelity which help create a fabric of peace, justice, and understanding.

### Improving State Welfare Programs

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, although great improvement has been made in the welfare programs in this country during the past quarter century, experience has shown that much more needs to be done, especially in the State programs.

I am today introducing a bill providing for such improvements.

This bill, H.R. 6422, is designed to alleviate the plight of those many families throughout the country who find themselves in need as a result of unemployment and other factors beyond their control and for whom no provision is now made under Federal law. This bill, which would authorize the Federal Government to assist the States in meeting the full range of needs now confronting their public welfare agencies, is similar to bills I have introduced in previous Congresses, but is given a new urgency by the persistence of unemployment currently affecting some 5 million American workers and their families.

This bill, entitled the "Public Welfare Act," incorporates the recommendations of leading national welfare organizations representing both public and voluntary agencies. Taken together with the bill, H.R. 4700, previously introduced by me to extend health benefits to beneficiaries of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the bill establishing minimum benefit standards in the unemployment insurance program which I am likewise supporting, this bill rounds out the program of immediate improvements in our total social security program urgently necessary to meet the most pressing needs today confronting large segments of our population. As such, the basic provisions in the bill have the support of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; the American Public Welfare Association; the National Association of Social Workers, and other groups representing those affected by our social security measures.

We are rightfully proud of the steady growth in coverage and benefits under

the social insurance aspects of the social security program and the extent to which this has reduced dependence on public assistance among the able-bodied aged, surviving widows, and the older disabled group. Last year improvements were also made in the financing of public assistance and in the child welfare program. But pride in progress cannot be allowed to blind us to the areas of insecurity and hardship that still remain. Extensive and persistent unemployment over the past year has served to remind us of the vulnerability of our working people to the hazards of the modern economy. We must move toward a national policy which, first, reduces the chances of any individual or family in the United States becoming needy but, second, provides its own built-in assurance that if this contingency befalls, provision will be made to meet those needs. This is the purpose of my bill.

Public welfare provides the ultimate protection to individuals under our total system of social security. When all other resources fail, it is to the State and local public welfare agencies that an individual must turn for help. If a worker cannot find a job, when his unemployment insurance rights and savings are exhausted he becomes dependent upon public assistance. If a worker or farmer or small businessman becomes ill, he may find his savings quickly exhausted in heavy medical and living expenses. Then he has no choice but to turn to his State or local public welfare office. But under the present assistance provisions of the Social Security Act the Federal Government takes no responsibility for assisting the public welfare agencies in meeting the needs of people who do not qualify under the four existing categorical programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. As a result, in most States provision for the needy unemployed is miserably inadequate and even, in some localities, virtually nonexistent. In other States with a heavy incidence of unemployment, funds for the purpose have been repeatedly exhausted despite every effort to make adequate provision. It is self-evident that the States with heavy and persistent unemployment not only have a disproportionate need but are in the worst fiscal position to meet that need from State and local resources.

Unemployment is an attribute of the national economy, and the development of policies to assure individual security is a national responsibility. The Federal Government should not only take steps to prevent unemployment and to assist depressed areas in making needed economic readjustments, but it should also assume its fair share of responsibility in protecting all its people, wherever they may live, against its hazards. The first line of defense is through a strengthened unemployment insurance program; the second is through a strengthened program of public welfare which is the purpose of this bill.

Public welfare, under our Federal system of government, is the primary responsibility of the States and their political subdivision. The grant-in-aid

system, which has developed extensively as an instrument of public policy since 1933, is designed to combine the advantages of decentralized administration with the broader financial base of the Federal Government and the need for basic national programs in areas of national concern. My bill, following this extremely successful principle, is designed to give the States the maximum latitude in adapting their own public welfare programs to changing needs. It does not affect the existing provisions of titles I, IV, V, and XIV of the Social Security Act but rather offers the States the option of combining all or part of these specialized public welfare programs for particular groups into a comprehensive program of aid for all needy persons and of needed social services. The administrative and policy advantages of such a simplified plan are obvious, especially to the individual in need of public welfare aid, who today often finds himself bewildered by a variety of agencies, eligibility standards, and requirements. Many State welfare policy-makers and administrators would welcome the opportunity to move in this direction but are today prevented by the limitations of Federal law. On the other hand, there is no compulsion upon the States under my proposal to abandon any specialized welfare program which is felt to be serving the best interests of a particular group.

The rapid growth in our social insurance programs has created a substantial change in the character of the public welfare function which has not yet been reflected in changes in Federal and State law. Increasingly, public welfare is being called upon to meet the unusual or unpredictable situation or to provide for needs which have not yet been provided for through social insurance or other preventive measures. Thus, the nature of the public welfare task tends to change in emphasis. Today, for example, many retired OASDI beneficiaries are obliged to turn to public welfare for help when they become ill. But soon it is hoped we can provide hospital and related benefits for these people as a part of the insurance program. No one wants a large public welfare program, but we do want one which is sufficiently flexible and comprehensive to meet actual need as it occurs. The only way to do this is through legislation which provides the machinery, the policies, and the built-in financing provisions to meet such needs whenever they arise. We do not want to be confronted again with the need for emergency legislation as we were in 1933—or even last year, or again this year, with our unemployment insurance program. We want a strong institutional structure that can be quickly adapted to actual needs whether they arise from economic factors, social change, or disaster situations.

The State public welfare agencies have been handicapped in adapting their own programs and in making the best use of their own resources and personnel by the rigid compartmentalization and restrictive scope of Federal aid. This bill proposes to remedy this situation by providing the optional alternative of a single public welfare plan with

more adaptable provisions relating to eligibility, financing, and scope of service. In return for this greater flexibility, States are required to provide assistance for all persons who qualify within their own standards of need without arbitrary exclusions such as those based on residence. The bill also recognizes the importance of individual determinations and service as an intrinsic element in all public welfare functions thus making it possible to bring about a closer coordination of all welfare programs in a single public welfare agency. The advantage of such a simplified approach to the person who needs help, to the administrator, and to the public constitutes a major argument for giving early consideration to this proposal.

In the statement which follows a more detailed explanation of the provisions of this bill is given.

**First. General:** The bill provides a new title XVI for the Social Security Act under which a State could submit a comprehensive public welfare plan for assistance to needy persons and welfare services as defined in the bill. States that wish to do so could continue to operate programs of assistance under the existing provisions to titles I, IV, X, and XIV but the new matching provisions described below are applicable only to title XVI and the usual provision is made to preclude assistance payments to any individual under more than one title of the act. For most States the scope, flexibility, and financial provisions of title XVI would probably prove an inducement to change, but the optional feature would ease the transitional process and make it possible for a State, which wished to retain certain programs—as, for example, aid to the blind—on the present basis, to do so.

**Second. Coverage for assistance:** This bill makes it possible for a State to receive Federal aid for assistance to any needy person, including those who are in need because of unemployment, and not exclusively for those over 65, blind, permanently, and totally disabled, or those meeting the restrictive definition for aid to dependent children—as at present. Administration by categorical groups would, however, be optional with the States, provided the basis for establishing the categories was reasonable. Assistance could not, however, be paid to persons residing in public institutions other than medical institutions nor to patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

**Third. Financial ceilings or the maximum average payments subject to Federal aid would be increased to \$75 a month for all adults and \$50 for all children. Present maxima in old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are based on an average of \$65 a month; in aid to dependent children the present ceiling is an average of \$30 for each individual.**

**Fourth. A new and simplified system of matching would replace the present formulas. Under the proposed formula the total of all assistance payments—**

within the average ceilings as shown in 3 above—would receive a 62 percent Federal reimbursement in any State whose average per capita income was the same as that of the United States as a whole. For States above this average the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately decreased but would in no case fall below 50 percent. For States with a lower than average per capita income the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately increased but the maximum level of reimbursement would be 80 percent. Under this formula the needy in both the high and low income States would benefit: The former by the higher reimbursable ceilings and the latter by the higher rate of reimbursement.

Fifth. Welfare services provided by the public welfare agency would be subject to the same rate of reimbursement as assistance payments. Increasingly those persons turning to public welfare agencies for aid are those with special needs requiring knowledgeable service for their solution. Such service can often help speed the return of the individual to self-support, secure for him the care he needs from other sources, prevent serious or long-term future difficulties, and reduce the cost to the public of extended dependency. For example: Many people needing medical care or rehabilitative service do not know what provisions are available or how to go about applying for them. Many people are lingering in general or mental hospitals simply because they have no other place to go—and no one to help them find such a place; many people living in areas where their former source of livelihood has ceased to exist need help in moving to areas of new opportunity; many children might be saved from juvenile delinquency or other forms of costly social maladjustment if their parents received helpful guidance at the crucial time or—in cases where substitute family care was necessary—the child welfare services of the public welfare agency could make prompt and adequate provision for their adoptive or foster-care placement. An advantage of this bill to the child welfare program is the fact that it permits child welfare workers to apply assistance funds to the placement of needy children requiring foster care. The grave injustice done to this neediest group of children under the present act, which denies assistance to children not living with a close relative, was pointed out by the welfare report of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations.

Sixth. Simplified administration, with consequent benefits to those requiring public welfare aid as well as to those who do its work and pay its cost, is provided in this bill in several ways. Matching on the average of all payments, the optional elimination of categorical administration, and the provision of the same reimbursement formula for all types of aid would permit reduction in paperwork with subsequent reduction in the cost of overhead administration. The bill also requires that the program be administered

by a single agency at each level of government. From the point of view of the individual or family requiring help the advantage of a single agency is obvious.

Seventh. Availability of benefits: The bill makes it a condition of the broadened base of Federal financial assistance provided by this new title that its benefits should be available to all qualified persons without residence or citizenship requirements. No public welfare program can be considered to be fulfilling its function as the ultimate guarantee against individual need if it arbitrarily excludes needy persons solely because of their length of residence. The very factors that make it essential for the Federal Government to share the broad public welfare responsibilities of the States make it equally essential that such aid be available to all.

Eighth. The Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico: This bill rights a long-standing injustice toward our fellow American citizens in the Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by extending to these jurisdictions the same program provisions as apply in the States and Territories.

Ninth. Confidential assistance records: This bill restores to all persons receiving assistance under this title the protection formerly required by all titles that the facts concerning their receipt of assistance be treated as confidential information.

Tenth. Personnel training: The bill recognizes the serious shortages in qualified public welfare personnel by providing special financial aid on a continuing basis for training such personnel.

## Foreign Languages and the National Interest

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week Representative JOHN BRADEMAs of Indiana delivered an address at Valparaiso University entitled "Foreign Languages and the National Interest." The theme of this fine talk was that the lack in our country of adequate foreign language training is hindering our attempts to strengthen the free world and combat the tyrannical aspirations of Soviet communism.

I wish to commend Representative JOHN BRADEMAs for calling attention to what he aptly describes as our language gap. I concur completely with him in advocating greater emphasis on language training. This is a subject in which I have been very much interested.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had the opportunity to study foreign language training programs; in particular those

conducted by our Federal Government. Only last week I submitted from the Committee on Government Operations a report, Senate Report No. 153, as prepared by my subcommittee, entitled "The Federal Government's Foreign Language Training Programs." In the foreword to this report I stated:

It is time we give full recognition to the indisputable fact that foreign language training is indispensable to our military effort, to our overseas economic programs, and, without question, the key to our ability to win friends throughout the world. It is high time that we do something about it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the thoughtful address of Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(Text of an address by Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, Third District, Indiana, at the annual spring meeting of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., April 11, 1959)

Some years ago I spent several weeks in Mexico where for the first time I had the opportunity to try out my high school Spanish. At one stage of a conversation, I groped for a phrase to indicate that I was, for any one of a number of reasons, embarrassed. Not knowing the exact word, I reached for a cognate and confidently said to my Mexican friends, "Con toda franqueza, estoy embarazado." They shrieked with laughter and amazement.

For the non-Hispanists among you, "embarazado" in Spanish means "with child" and, I need hardly add, is an adjective confined to the feminine gender, i.e., "embarazada."

After an experience like that I require no persuasion of the importance of understanding foreign languages.

### CITES INTEREST IN LANGUAGES

I am honored by the opportunity to speak today at the annual spring meeting of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association. There are several reasons I feel at home with members of your organization. Because my father was born in Europe, early in life I became aware that there were languages other than English, although, to my later regret, I did not trouble to take advantage of the opportunity to learn his native tongue, Greek.

My own graduate studies in the modern political history of Spain could not have been completed had I not been able to use my knowledge of Spanish, somewhat improved from the visit to Mexico, to interview Spaniards who had themselves participated in the events I was seeking to analyze.

As your chairman has indicated, I have also been a college teacher and am therefore familiar with some of the problems you face.

It happens, moreover, that I serve on the General Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee in the House of Representatives and I am, therefore, directly concerned in my legislative duties with the field of education.

The vastly increased interest which Americans are now demonstrating in education at every level is, of course, a source of great encouragement to us all. It is with respect to one of the most significant areas in the field of education that I should like to speak today, the area of foreign languages.

The United States has in the postwar world assumed the awesome and troubling, but

nonetheless indispensable, burden of leadership of the free world against the tyrannical aspirations of Soviet communism. We have undertaken programs of political, military, and economic cooperation with our friends and allies throughout the entire world. Yet we still pursue what I should describe as a semi-isolationist policy when it comes to learning the languages essential to communicating with our friends, understanding the uncommitted peoples of the world, and evaluating the challenges posed by our potential enemies.

#### THE LANGUAGE GAP

More than 3 million of our citizens are living and working abroad as members of the Armed Forces, the diplomatic corps, and various technical missions engaged in industry. Yet comparatively few of these Americans can speak any language but their own with fluency. It is a simple fact that we are woefully behind the times in learning foreign languages. And there can be little question that the interest of our country suffers, and suffers seriously, because of what, to paraphrase another more controversial aspect of our national security system, might be called our language gap.

#### U.S. DIPLOMATS LACK LANGUAGES

The problem of the language gap in America is particularly acute in the one spot where it should not be—our diplomatic corps. An Ambassador or consul in a foreign capital is perhaps an exception rather than the rule if he speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther declared a few weeks ago that, of the 8,000 men and women who recently passed the academic requirements for the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, only 300 had a language qualification beyond English. Our embassies and legations are forced to employ thousands of foreign nationals as translators and office staff largely because there are no Americans qualified for these jobs.

I am glad to say that, thanks in part to the criticisms of James Reston, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times, the Foreign Service Institute has in the last couple of years intensified its efforts to train more of our Foreign Service officers in foreign languages. But there is a long way to go before the United States does an effective job, even for those who are the official representatives of our Government abroad, of bridging this language gap.

#### "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

In "The Ugly American," that disturbing and challenging novel about Americans stationed abroad, Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer provide a parable which dramatizes the link between foreign languages and the national interest. In the mythical Asian country of Sarkhan, the Russian Ambassador promises the natives thousands and thousands of tons of rice to stem a local famine. The rice arrives but it is American rice, on each bag of which Sarkhanese Communists have stealthily stenciled in Sarkhanese for each citizen to see and read for himself: "This rice is a gift from Russia."

The Americans take pictures of the distribution of the rice and the smiling faces of the now happy people. There is no comment from any of the Americans present. None of them can read or understand Sarkhanese, and they do not know what is happening.

It would not be difficult to spend the rest of my time here today citing factual, not fictional, examples of how our incompetence in languages has damaged our relations with foreign countries and, by so doing, has worked against the vital interests of the United States. Members of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association, however, do not need to be persuaded

of the significant relationship between foreign languages and the national interest.

I do think it would be profitable for us to examine briefly our deficiencies and then ask ourselves what to do about them.

The language gap of which I speak is in large part of our own making. Beginning with World War I, foreign language instruction was systematically discouraged in our public schools, with 22 States passing laws forbidding the teaching of German and other foreign languages. Some shortsighted persons would likewise today impair our national security by insisting that we should not provide for the teaching of Russian in our public schools.

Although advances in aviation and communication in the period between World Wars I and II brought foreign lands closer and closer, Americans have held to the belief that the time spent studying languages could be more profitably employed in other academic endeavors. We are now tasting the fruits of this irresponsible attitude.

#### FEW U.S. HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS STUDY LANGUAGES

Today less than 15 percent of our total public high school students are studying a modern foreign language. Of these, only a handful are studying Russian, German, Portuguese, Italian or Chinese. None are learning such strategic world languages as Japanese, Arabic, Hindi, Malay, Bengali, or Ukrainian.

Even if we decided right now to expand substantially the language study opportunities for our young people, it would be impossible to find enough adequately trained teachers. Two years ago the supply of new high school language teachers was over 25 percent short of the demand, and I have no doubt that the current rise in interest in language education has made the shortage of competent teachers still more serious.

Today, partly because of the lack of qualified teachers, less than one half of our public schools are able to offer a course in any modern foreign language. A recent survey showed that only 24 percent of Indiana's schools offer instruction in a modern foreign language.

#### RUSSIANS EMPHASIZE LANGUAGE TRAINING

Our failings in this area are all the more tragic when they are compared with the achievements of our cold war adversary. On the primary and secondary school level, most Russian students begin language training in the fifth grade and continue language training for 6 years. Before completion of their high school studies they will have spent 660 hours learning another language.

Those Soviet students who go on to college are required to demonstrate foreign language competence in order to get into college and must take at least 2 years of languages while there. The Soviet Union has also developed extensive language training programs for diplomats and for technical people sent abroad with their foreign assistance programs.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas warned only last month of "the fierce competition from the Russians who have made language one of their great specialties."

"Telugu"—and I am quoting Justice Douglas—"is a language spoken by 33 million people in India. Yet we have not six people who can read a Telugu newspaper. When the Soviet delegate arrives, however, not only he but his staff are versed in Telugu. The Russian foreign language expert is not only the foreign service official but the Soviet technical expert as well. In medicine alone, Russia is turning out many more doctors than she can use at home. These doctors of hers are trained in Asian and African languages as well as in medicine. They are prepared to practice abroad and

to spread the gospel of communism. What is true of the Russian doctor is also true of the Russian engineer, agricultural expert, and scientist."

#### LANGUAGE GAP COMMANDS CONCERN

That the language gap is beginning to command the concern of more and more persons in our country is evidenced by three random articles I have come upon in the last few days. The *Laporte Herald-Argus*, published just a few miles from where we now meet, said in an editorial last month that "the blithe insistence of Americans doing their stretches of time in distant lands on keeping aloof from the 'natives,' refusing to learn the language, appreciate the customs, or participate as citizens-for-a-time does us irreparable harm, and explains a good deal of the anti-American sentiment in many areas."

The current issue of *Women's Day*, a magazine sold in many supermarkets, contains a stimulating article entitled, "Why Can't Our Children Speak a Foreign Language?" John R. Walsh, education writer for the *Louisville Times*, in a recent report, describes the sweeping plan of Catholic colleges, high schools, and elementary schools in the Louisville area to coordinate language teaching from top to bottom and to place strong emphasis on the elementary level.

#### PRaises Prof. William Riley Parker

I am sure then that there is growing recognition of the serious shortcoming of this country in the development of persons skilled in modern languages and of the fact that this weakness is prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. The next question is: What can we do about it?

The natural resource which can most quickly be utilized is the trained body of language teachers now engaged in teaching. Certainly no one would dispute the proposition that all teachers would benefit by an opportunity to increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. In an excellent study for UNESCO, entitled "The National Interest and Foreign Languages," Prof. William Riley Parker of the University of Indiana, presently Chief of the Language Development Program in the U.S. Office of Education, cites the example of the language teacher who has only the minimum training required to teach languages and, as a result, has reached the limits of his knowledge after teaching a 2-year course. If we are to give our students competent and extensive training in languages, we must have teachers who know the languages as thoroughly as possible.

Let me pause to pay a word of tribute to Dr. Parker for the splendid work he is doing to remedy the lag in languages we are discussing. All of us in Indiana should be proud of his contributions, and I want to express the hope that all of you who have not already done so will read Dr. Parker's first-class analysis of foreign languages and the national interest.

#### HAILE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

I am very pleased to tell you of a significant effort now under way to attack the basic problem in language development in the United States: the shortage of good language teachers. The National Defense Education Act, passed by the 85th Congress, contains a number of provisions which are evidence of the awareness of Congress of our deplorable backwardness in this field. In fact, the only one of the 10 titles of the act which rode serenely through all the hearings and all the debates was the one dealing with languages.

The National Defense Education Act provides for the establishment of summer foreign language institutes where language teachers may take additional training in the languages they teach. Four institutes have

already been set up for this summer at the Universities of Colorado, Maine, Michigan, and Louisiana State. Because we in Congress last month voted a supplemental appropriation of \$75 million for the Defense Education Act, six more institutes will be established this summer. They will accommodate an additional 600 teachers. The institute program should, in its first year of operation, provide 8 weeks of training for 1,000 teachers.

The need for this kind of program and the enthusiastic response on the part of language teachers is demonstrated by the fact that the first institute established—at the University of Colorado—has received applications from every State in the Union at the rate, as of last month, of 100 per day.

For those of you interested in the foreign language institutes, and I hope that includes everyone here, I might say that the program provides a \$75 weekly stipend for public school teachers, plus \$15 a week for each dependent.

Parenthetically, let me mention a conversation I had in Washington a few days ago with Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Eugene Burdick, both of whom told me of the tragic fact that the Army Language School at Monterey, Calif., a first-class center for the teaching of languages, is operating at less than half capacity.

#### URGES INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR LANGUAGE TEACHER TRAVEL

With the increasing emphasis on teaching students to speak, as well as to read and write foreign languages, I think it might be wise to encourage teachers to increase their knowledge of the spoken language. The best way to achieve this goal is to spend some time living in a foreign country.

I am sure that most of you would be happy indeed to travel abroad, but, as college teachers, you are inhibited by the lack of money. Because I am so deeply convinced of the value of such travel, I am considering the introduction of legislation to permit language teachers a partial income tax deduction for the expenses of trips designed to increase their knowledge of a foreign language.

#### CITES AREA CENTERS FOR RARE LANGUAGES

The summer institute program represents a very promising start in our efforts to provide this Nation with competent linguists, but it does little to increase the number of trained language teachers or to provide trained linguists, teachers, and teaching materials for the so-called exotic languages, those which are rarely taught in this country.

Our incompetence in the field of the exotic languages is demonstrated by a recent survey made by the American Council of Learned Societies which revealed that at least 50 languages—each of them spoken by more than 2 million people, 14 of them spoken by between 10 and 42 million—are not taught in any American college or university.

The National Defense Education Act does, however, provide a means for attacking our lack of proficiency in the exotic languages. The act provides for the establishment of language area centers for the development of facilities to teach these languages. Let me list the goals of the area center program:

(a) Intensive courses available frequently and at geographically distributed locations.

(b) The production of several complete sets of reliable and effective teaching materials.

(c) Adequate instruction in related area studies.

Some of these language area centers would use existing facilities at colleges and universities. Others would be developed from scratch. The centers would be financed through a system of matching grants. If we can put these centers into operation, we

should be able to build up a pool of trained linguists who, in turn, would be available to train more students throughout the Nation. The development of suitable materials would provide insurance should we quickly need large numbers of trained personnel in any specific language.

You will be interested to know that the study conducted by the American Council of Learned Societies showed the languages most needed now by Americans are Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hindustani, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish.

One or more area centers will be established for all of these languages except French, German, Italian, and Spanish, which are available at most colleges and universities.

#### NOTES STUDENT LOANS TO ENCOURAGE TEACHERS

The Defense Education Act also encourages the college student to consider a language-teaching career by providing writeoffs on student loans, granted under the act, to students who subsequently teach in the public schools. The student is allowed to write off 10 percent of his loan for each year that he teaches up to a maximum of 5 years.

The important place given to languages in the National Defense Education Act is, I believe, a symbol of the growing realization among the citizens of the United States of the contribution to our country of your profession. The Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association is to be congratulated for following the recommendation of the Modern Language Association that each State establish a group to include all teachers of foreign languages in the State. State educational officials will look to organizations like yours for advice and help in putting the foreign-language provisions of the Defense Education Act into practice.

#### PROPOSES NATIONAL LANGUAGE FOUNDATION

Indeed, I would urge that your organization and others like it consider seriously an effort to create an agency similar to the National Science Foundation for the purpose of marshaling support for the study of foreign languages and cultures. Just as the National Science Foundation is a source of strength for scientific endeavor in our country, so, too, a National Language Foundation could serve as a coordinating agency and rallying point to intensify interest in language education.

It will be 2 or 3 years before we can see evidence of real progress from some of the programs I have discussed. Meanwhile, all across the Nation parents, teachers, and school boards are displaying an awakened interest in language education. Students, housewives, and factory workers are arising with the sun to take Russian on early morning television programs. PTA groups are asking schools to teach Russian or Japanese to their first graders.

This new interest is a splendid example of the capacity of the American people to respond to a challenge. There is, however, a danger that these crash programs will collapse because of an inadequate foundation and the lack of a continuing planned program.

#### CALLS FOR LANGUAGE TRAINING FROM PRIMARY TO COLLEGE LEVEL

A good deal is said about the advantages of teaching the fundamentals of a foreign language to young children who have the ability to assimilate such knowledge without pain or embarrassment. I believe that we should do all we can to encourage the teaching of languages to children at the primary level, provided that at the same time we prepare advanced training for these students at the secondary and college level.

These primary programs should be carefully planned so that we do not disappoint both the students and their parents by start-

ing on an exciting venture, only to be stopped by the dead end of inadequate preparation.

#### SUGGESTS FOREIGN-BORN AMERICANS TEACH LANGUAGES

I shall dare to make another suggestion. There have been many cities and towns ready and willing to begin language instruction in the primary grades, but which were unable to find qualified teachers. This, in many cases, is not because we lack a significant number of competent linguists in this country, but rather because too few of these linguists meet State and local teaching certification requirements.

The suggestion I shall make is not a criticism of our certification requirements, but is rather a commonsense approach to the basic problem: How can we enable more Americans to learn foreign languages in the immediate future?

I would suggest that we make use of the many educated immigrants and foreign nationals now living in the United States who have complete command of their native tongue, who have the intelligence and background to teach these languages, but who may lack the necessary college credits to qualify as teachers.

It would seem quite possible that evening or summer courses could adequately prepare these people to teach languages to primary students, especially since the language teacher could have the aid of the regular classroom teacher. Later these people could be replaced by regularly trained teachers, or, if they wished, could take the courses required by State laws to become fully qualified teachers.

In the meantime, they could be imparting their knowledge of the correct pronunciation, tone, and inflection of their native language to the receptive minds of young students. These students would then be able to take full advantage of advanced courses on the high-school and college level.

#### URGES IMMIGRANTS TO TEACH THEIR CHILDREN NATIVE TONGUE

Foreign-born Americans and foreign nationals living in our country are an invaluable resource whom we have too long neglected. In this connection, let me say that I believe it is a patriotic duty of American citizens of foreign birth to teach their children a second language. Immigrants should take pride in the fact that they can contribute in this significant way to the security and well-being of their adopted country.

#### PRaises CULVER ACADEMY RUSSIAN PROGRAM

Let me take this opportunity to point out that here in Indiana there are many school systems which have already started to improve the teaching of foreign languages. Very near here, for example, the Culver Military Academy has only recently hired a highly qualified language scholar to teach Russian to its students.

Maj. Gen. Delmar T. Spivey, superintendent of the academy, told me that the course was instituted because, "aside from the questions related to communism, when a country is as large in land mass and as populous as Russia is, the impact of its culture on Western civilization will be so great that it is absolutely essential for our citizens to gain a better understanding of this culture."

General Spivey added that he had found it very difficult to find a person competent to teach the Russian courses. I might say that I am glad to see that Saint Mary's College, where I taught for a time, has just begun to offer courses in Russian.

#### SPEAKING IN STRANGE TONGUES

Russian is but one of the many languages in which this country is deficient. In a world that seems to change overnight—every night—those of us who believe deeply in democracy as the best political expression of the dignity of the individual must speak

clearly to the peoples of the world, millions of whom are now for the first time moving to the stage of human history.

We must, if we are really to be understood by these peoples and to understand them, speak to them in their own language.

This is the fundamental reason we must bridge the language gap.

In the Acts of the Apostles we read of those who were speaking in strange tongues.

The future of free civilization will very largely depend on how well we in America can speak strange tongues and listen to them.

How well we speak and listen depends in turn on how well you, the members of the foreign language profession, teach our young people.

Yours is a high and noble calling and I am confident that you will respond with dedication to its challenges.

## Extension of Medical Resources

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. On April 5 the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from Alaska, officiated at the dedication of a new library, auditorium, and lounge at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University in New York City.

The facilities dedicated were the D. Samuel Gottesman Library, the Mary and Karl Robbins Auditorium, and the Max L. and Sadie Friedman student-faculty lounge, constructed on the campus of the college of medicine. The units, embodying the most modern facilities for medical education, were a medical library with provisions for 200,000 volumes and periodicals; an auditorium seating 838, equipped for closed-circuit color television; and a student-faculty lounge, providing for informal get-togethers of students and faculty.

Speakers at the ceremony, in addition to Senator GRUENING, were Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, and former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein, chairman of the board of overseers of the college of medicine.

Addressing the assemblage of leaders in industry, community affairs, and education, Dr. Belkin declared:

Let there be a friendly rivalry among scientists of different lands for new discoveries against cancer, heart disease, and other dread killers. Let the libraries of the great cities vie with one another on the size and quality of their book collections. Let the major universities of different nations compete in the scope and daring of their educational programs. Let nations be judged on the merits of their medical training and research rather than on the size of their warheads.

In a greater sense and larger measure, we are dedicating ourselves here to the spiritual and democratic concept of the infinite worth and sacredness of the human personality. Because human life is sacred, it is our moral duty to do everything in our power to preserve it.

General Goldstein, referring to the teamwork of scientists and businessmen

who had helped create the college of medicine, said:

In the world competition for better health facilities, more educational opportunities, higher standards of scientific achievement, we need fear no nation in the world. A free-enterprise system that can give rise to institutions like the Albert Einstein College of Medicine is its own proof of essential soundness and creativity.

Medical advances in our golden age of science have paradoxically raised alarming new problems in health. With the increase in our population, particularly of the aged, health and disease problems have arisen which call for a far greater tempo in medical education and the numbers of medical researchers, teachers, and physicians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Senator from Alaska be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE D. SAMUEL GOTTESMAN LIBRARY, MARY AND KARL ROBBINS AUDITORIUM, MAX L. AND SADIE FRIEDMAN STUDENT FACULTY LOUNGE AT THE ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, APRIL 5, 1959

It is a privilege to participate in any ceremony which further commemorates the name of Albert Einstein, though it is beyond the power of the living to enhance by words the fame of that great man. No posthumous tributes can add one cubit to his stature. He belongs to the ages. In the roster of immortals who have signally advanced the frontiers of knowledge, and whose contributions were milestones in the progress of mankind, only a very few in all recorded history may be deemed comparable: Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Pasteur, Darwin. But Einstein was not only a great scientist, he was also a great humanitarian—a philanthropist in the generic sense of that word, a lover of his fellow man. He deeply sensed the philosophic import of his cosmic discoveries in physical science. He was keenly aware of their epoch-making impact.

So it is doubly significant and twice just that the college of medicine of Yeshiva University was named after him. For a college of medicine combines, as no other institution could, pure science, of a character which directly benefits both the individual and society, and extension of those benefits with a total disregard of barriers of race, creed, or country. What institution could be nobler in purpose?

I am happy to be here with you at the dedication of three important additions to this already great and prospectively greater and enduring institution—the library, auditorium, and a student and faculty lounge. It is a welcome assignment to bring you the greetings of the 49th State, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate, where Alaska is represented for the first time. Alaska's elevation from territorialism and the recent admission of Hawaii, which followed more or less naturally after Alaska had, so to speak, broken the ice, are important steps forward in the application of that most basic of American principles, the principle of government by consent of the governed.

The Senate is deeply concerned with the problems which this ceremony today signalizes—health, medical education, and research to promote that health. A Senate resolution of the 85th Congress adopted as recently as last August authorizing a complete study of all matters pertaining to international health, research, rehabilitation, and assistance programs, was based on the declared assumption that "mankind's efforts for the conquest of disease have become a matter

of ever higher priority in the judgment of the American people and the Congress."

The first of a series of these studies, under the auspices of the Senate Committee on Government Operations of which I am a member, is about to appear and I have been reading the galley proofs thereof. One of the encouraging facts cited in this report is that expenditures for national medical research have risen from \$88 million a decade ago to \$330 million last year and that the Federal Government's participation in the same period has risen from 32 percent of that total to 56 percent; an increase by Uncle Sam from \$28 million a decade ago to \$184 million. There is no better test of the Government's interest in a project than its willingness to appropriate for such project. Here, as in other fields, actions speak louder than words. So the Federal Government's interest is tangible and demonstrable.

In addition, in this, the 86th Congress, another highly important joint resolution, known as the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959 is slated, I hope, for early action. It is sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—the committee whose jurisdiction includes both education and health.

Cosponsored by 58 Senators, of whom I am happy to be one, this measure is designed to establish the procedures which can mobilize the Nation's health resources so that our scientists can participate effectively in a co-operative effort with the scientists of other countries against the still unconquered diseases that afflict all mankind.

It is scarcely necessary to enumerate these diseases to this assemblage. In 1957 cancer killed one American every 2 minutes. If we project that figure into a rough approximation of its worldwide toll—although we do not have statistics available for the world population—we will discover approximately one cancer fatality every 10 seconds on this planet. Many of the fatalities occur in early adulthood. It is among the premature deaths, among the parents of the young, among the breadwinners, among those still in the prime of life, that are found the great personal tragedies.

Last year diseases of the heart and cardiovascular system accounted for approximately one-half of the total deaths from disease in the United States—some 800,000, and of these more than one-fifth had not reached the age of retirement.

Mental illness which now affects over 10 million Americans and appears to be on the increase, is a vast field only beginning to be explored.

Modern invention, the steadily accelerating tempo of contemporary life, ironically, bring new medical problems. Automobiles on the faster thoroughways increase the accident rate and require emergency antishock treatment and surgery which were not required in the horse and buggy age. Aviation medicine—to take care of the physiological concomitants of rarefied atmosphere, rapidly changing atmospheric pressures, and other implications of supersonic speeds into space—is upon us. This is a field closely linked with national security and the preservation of the freedom we enjoy.

Radiation from atomic fallout has brought new grave perils, new medical time-bombs, the full import and consequences of which we are not yet wholly aware, except that they present new challenges both to medicine and to statesmanship.

It is the objective of this legislation now before the Congress to sound a call for world cooperation in an organized onslaught against disease and ill health and the resolution has been given an appropriate short title, namely "Health for Peace Act." It asks for an appropriation of \$50 million annually. Its passage by the Congress will serve notice to all peoples that the United States desires

worldwide cooperation, not for war among nations, not for mutual destruction of our fellow human beings, but for an all-out war against the common enemy of man. Modern methods of communication and transportation render such cooperations more feasible. As the world has shrunk through the annihilation of distance and reduction of travel time, cooperative effort is not only facilitated but is rendered more obligatory through the rapid spread of infectious diseases which can span continents with a speed heretofore nonexistent.

It is an interesting fact that Senator LISTER HILL, who is responsible for so much good legislation dealing with health, such as the Hill-Burton Hospital Act, is the son of a noted American surgeon, Dr. Luther Hill, who was the first to perform a successful suture of the human heart. He had studied in London under the great Sir Joseph Lister, who introduced aseptic techniques into surgery, and had given his son the name of LISTER.

Likewise I want to bring you the greetings of Alaska, until a few days ago I could have said our youngest State, whose citizens will be keenly interested in this young medical school. At present only 118 physicians are licensed to practice in Alaska, an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States. Vast areas in that great domain lack adequate medical services. This unfortunate condition exists in all but 11 of our largest communities and in the immediate surroundings of certain hospitals established by the U.S. Public Health Service. These hospitals are designed to take care of our native population—"native" being an Alaskan word for people of aboriginal descent, that is, of Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut blood, but, by a curious reverse racial discrimination which we are trying to rectify, these agencies will not treat whites. Large Alaskan regions, the Yukon Basin, many areas both coastal and in the interior, are almost totally lacking in medical services, and many of their people live and die without benefit of therapy. Alaska's crucial needs are best illustrated by giving you these tragic facts:

We have in Alaska the highest recorded rate of eye, ear, nose, and throat infections and their complications, such as mastoiditis.

Although our incidence of tuberculosis has been greatly reduced in recent years from the shocking ratio of nine times what it was in the 48 States 10 years ago, it is still a great and smoldering danger.

Infant mortality is high in rural Alaska, mostly in children less than a year old, and this is largely due to nutritional and hygiene factors.

Dental disease in rural Alaska is extreme and exerts an inevitable adverse influence on general health. Some communities have never had dental care. Instead they have dental cars.

These conditions are the heritage of nearly a century of colonialism. We have liquidated that colonialism on paper, through statehood, but the economic and social consequences of those 92 years of neglect and discrimination remain to be disposed of. And here is a challenge for the forthcoming graduates of this and other medical schools, as well as for our State and Federal authorities.

I am not quite sure why I was so signally honored with the opportunity to dedicate these great new additions to the Einstein College of Medicine. Perhaps an explanation may be found in some personal references. Medicine has played an important part in my life. My father was a practicing physician in New York. He was an oculist and an aurist, probably the last man to practice both these specialties in Manhattan, where, prior to his death in 1914, these two important branches of medicine, as in other metropolitan areas, had come to be separately practiced. My father attained distinction

in both, having been elected president of two societies that, in his lifetime, dealt with each, the American Ophthalmological Society and the American Otological Society. Since his day otology has expanded its domain, laterally and vertically, has annexed the nose and throat, or perhaps better said, has formed a tripartite union with rhinology and laryngology. But in earlier days nose and throat were considered somewhat apart from eye and ear. Fortunately medical disciplines, unlike some labor unions, are not prone to jurisdictional disputes.

So I grew up in a medical atmosphere and, even as a boy, became familiar with the institutions that my father served: The New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, the Mount Sinai Hospital, and the German Hospital, later renamed the Lenox Hill Hospital, in which he successively passed through the various echelons and ultimately became the consulting surgeon in his specialties in these hospitals. While still in school, I watched him perform a mastoid operation at Mount Sinai and remove a cataract at Eye and Ear. My father was once asked what the definition of a consulting surgeon was. In a humorous vein he replied wryly that a consulting surgeon was one who was called in at the last minute to share the blame.

The assumption was inevitable that, as the only son in the family, I would follow in father's footsteps, and I did study medicine and obtained my M.D. at Harvard Medical School. However fascinating the pursuit of medicine, a number of factors led me to the belief that I would be happier in attempting to diagnose and treat the ills of the body politic rather than the ailments of the bodies corporal. So I decided to give up medicine and entered newspaper work, starting as a cub reporter. It was a serious blow to my father. But he became reconciled, after I had become an editorial writer and he found that a number of my editorials were being reprinted in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and hailed by its editor as welcome examples of seldom encountered correct comment on medical matters in the daily press of the day.

So my medical education proved of great value in journalism, as it did likewise later in government. In fact, one of my collateral efforts, although I was on what was known as the editorial side of newspapers—as reporter, copy desk editor, rewrite man, editorial writer, city editor and managing editor—was to try to persuade the business office of the newspapers for which I worked to ban medical advertising.

In those days, the first and second decades of the century, advertising of quack doctors and of patent medicines that were guaranteed to cure cancer, tuberculosis, venereal disease, "female troubles" and every known ailment, was carried almost universally in the daily press. The lucrative patent medicine business was exposed by Samuel Hopkins Adams, a great journalist, who died only a few months ago at the age of 88, in a memorable series of articles in *Collier's* weekly, labeled "The Great American Fraud," subsequently published in book form. The unholy collusion between newspapers and this fraudulent medical advertising he subsequently unmasked in fiction form in a novel called "The Clarion," whose scene was laid in a New York Up-State city where some widely publicized patent medicines were manufactured and indeed were one of that community's principal industries. "The Clarion," in the novel, was the name of a locally published daily trying to free itself from that industry's control.

Adam's crusading served to awaken the public conscience and to mobilize public sentiment by making clear that, through the publication of these fraudulent nostrums, newspaper publishers were accessories to the killing of innocent people. I found it helpful to get Samuel Hopkins Adams to come to Boston to address its

chamber of commerce and to challenge these derelict publishers in their hometown. It was a bombshell, but it achieved the desired result.

But, before I turn from these personal recollections to the important and stimulating aspects of this occasion, I want to add that my medical education enabled me to help build and develop a school of tropical medicine in Puerto Rico, securing for it from the Federal Government substantial sums which I was dispensing as administrator of an agency known as the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, and, later, to have the school of tropical medicine expanded into the School of Medicine of Puerto Rico.

While in Alaska, my medical education enabled me to work more effectively to create a full-time department of health and to make a start in combating tuberculosis and other endemic diseases there, after a virtually total neglect of public health by the Federal authorities whose responsibility this had been during the first three-quarters of a century of American rule in Alaska.

But, as I have pointed out, Alaska still lacks much that it needs in the way of medical care and health facilities. Within this month, one of my medical friends from Fairbanks was here in the East looking for practitioners for his clinic, and similar shortages exist elsewhere. We know that our medical schools are not graduating the number of physicians who are needed. I am confident that the Einstein College of Medicine will make a major contribution to alleviating that deficiency.

I will not burden you with statistics, but one that is striking is that the medical educational facilities in the United States with 80-odd medical schools have been insufficient to take care of half the applicants or anywhere near the need. The number of these applicants may be expected to increase and in relation to population growth and need the percentage of accepted students to diminish. Hence the great value and importance of the Einstein College of Medicine.

This college emphasizes as no other institution could the international character of science and particularly of medicine. Located in the most cosmopolitan metropolis on earth, with populations of ethnic groups often numerically greater than in the largest cities in the land of their origins, a magnet for the greatest talent, a receptiveness to that talent, regardless of race or creed, it furnishes, in this land of freedom, the ideal center of hospitality for the scientists of lands less free.

Such was Abraham Jacobi, who, imprisoned in Germany for participating in the revolution of 1848, escaped and here in New York established the first pediatric clinic in America. Such was Albert Einstein and countless other physicians and scientists driven from their homeland by the obscurantism and racism of Hitler. Here were welcomed the refugees from Mussolini's Italy, from Franco's Spain. Here are welcome and will be welcomed whatever freedom-loving men and women have defected or will defect from the tyranny of Communist imperialism, or of any other police state.

In this age which has witnessed such a resurgence of nationalism, has seen the erection of barriers to travel and intercourse which a generation ago we believed had been forever outgrown, it is more than ever important to insist upon the international character of the profession of healing. In no arena of human endeavor have the men and women of so many nations contributed as they have to the advancement of medical science.

Hippocrates the Greek, father of medicine; Galen the Roman; Avicenna the Persian were among the pioneers in what was then the art of healing. We need but name a few of the luminaries whose work advanced medicine

into a science to make clear beyond pre-adventure the international character of medicine.

Vesalius and Leeuwenhoek, from the Netherlands; Arrhenius the Scandinavian; Harvey, Jenner, Bright, and Lister, Englishmen; Pasteur, the Curies, Binet, Charcot, from France; Casal, the Spaniard; Helmholtz, Virchow, Graefe, Roentgen, Koch, Ehrlich, Germans; Mendel and Freud, from Austria; Banting, from Canada; Metchnikoff and Pavlov, from Russia; Noguchi and Takamine, from Japan—these are only a few of a glorious list before we come to the great contributions of our fellow Americans with Jonas Salk and his antipolio vaccine as the latest bright star in the international galaxy. I hesitate to venture into an enumeration of the other stars in the American medical firmament. That would constitute a major address all by itself.

This vast medical center which has arisen from a wasteland in six miraculously short years, the buildings we are today dedicating, were born of a rare teamwork of businessmen and scientists, idealists all, yet practical men and women. These farsighted and public spirited citizens were fired with the vision of a Jewish-sponsored medical school—the first in our Nation's history. It would, they knew, continue the age-old contributions of the Jewish people to the health and welfare of mankind. They helped build this city of training, research, and healing that surrounds us here. They gave freely of their thought, their time, and their money to achieve that great objective.

They hoped, and their hope will be generously fulfilled, to emphasize by this creation that we are well into the golden era of medicine, the rapidity of whose advances must be consonant with the urgency of this age. They want to accelerate the great progress made in recent years—to spare the deaths and personal tragedies that came to many stricken by illnesses for which a few short years later a cure was found. They were aware that in the last 10 years, due largely to the discovery of sulfa drugs and antibiotics, the death rate has declined almost 12 percent. This means that 1,700,000 Americans are alive today who but for medical research would be in their graves.

They knew that surgical techniques had advanced so far that the touch-me-nots of yesteryear now hopefully invite the newer skills of surgeon and anesthetist, which save lives that but a few years ago would have been doomed.

They had seen the passing or great diminution of the infectious diseases that a generation ago swept communities with epidemic virulence. They have seen the incidence and fatality of diphtheria, typhoid fever, scarlet fever, tuberculosis, pneumonia, poliomyelitis, and much else, greatly diminished. They have seen life expectancy steadily increased. But they have also seen cancer and heart disease take their steady, perhaps increasing, toll. They have seen little headway made against crippling arthritis.

So they have deployed the laboratories, the classrooms, the operating rooms, the therapeutic apparatus, the most modern equipment in every sector, to wage a vigorous and unrelenting battle against sickness and premature death.

Adjacent are the thoroughly equipped facilities of the Abraham Jacobi and Nathan Van Etten Hospitals, and now the new D. Samuel Gottesman Library in which are housed some 200,000 volumes, in the expanding and multiplying subsiences together grouped under the all-inclusive title of medical books and publications—these recording the steady advance from conjecture and hypothesis to experiment, to trial and error, to proved experience, to near certainty—the cumulative experience of past and present, the prognosis for a still better future.

This great Mary and Karl Robbins Auditorium, visually linked to vital points in the medical center with its closed-circuit television, its modern equipment for auditory and visual communication, a center for the dissemination of information to medical and lay public alike on prevention and care of disease and on the maintenance of health.

This bright and cheerful lounge named for Max L. and Sadie Friedman, which will serve as a meeting ground for faculty and students and as a place for pleasurable relaxation and social contact.

I would like, in conclusion, if it were not deemed inappropriate, to paraphrase and adapt the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln:

We cannot dedicate these great gifts for the welfare of mankind. The Jewish people, in their unquenched idealism, in their age-long martyrdom, in their unremitting devotion to freedom, in their unceasing quest for the higher and better life, have dedicated these facilities far beyond our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what is said here. But uncounted tens of thousands through the years to come will never forget what will be done here.

### Holmes, Sweet Holmes

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the following syndicated column by Holmes Alexander appeared in recent issues of the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, and many newspapers through the country:

HECHLER PREACHES MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY BUT FINDS HE IS FLOGGING WRONG CULPRIT  
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman KEN HECHLER, who represents 10 West Virginia counties in the Ohio River Valley, was preaching mutiny on the bounty. He was telling the House Agriculture Committee that the free food for needy families in his district was not enough and not what the needy people were demanding.

Congressman HECHLER, born on Long Island and brought up in Missouri, is a strolling New Dealer who recently came to West Virginia and won this seat last year in the Democratic landslide. Now he was laying into the Republican Secretary of Agriculture with charges of ignorant indifference to human suffering ("Let 'em eat shrimp cocktails") and was tagging the Republican administration with spending billions for defense and peanuts for tribulation.

Representative HECHLER had it all going his way until some of the senior Democrats pointed out that he was flogging the wrong culprit. It turned out that the bottleneck was not at the Agriculture Department, but down at the West Virginia localities where the food hadn't been requested or hadn't been distributed for lack of funds, organization or manpower. This seems to be true in other States.

You can see what comes next. The Secretary of Agriculture has almost limitless emergency power to declare that a surplus exists in anything which Americans eat, chew, smoke or wear. He then can make this surplus product available to "needy"

families. Secretary Benson has done this in record amounts of food and dollars to a record number of Americans who are responding in record volume of complaints about the quantity, quality, and variety.

Next? Well, the trend of legislation in the 86th Congress is to vest more and more authority in federalism. Specifically, it may not be long before the Agriculture Secretary not only assigns food to the needy, but fetches it to the door. And pretty soon, as Congress broadens the definition of "needy," we can expect to find huge areas in the United States where people will learn to sing for their supper while obliging bureaucracies serve it up.

If this seems alien to the American tradition, the reason may be that our legislators are turning to non-American models for social betterment. In a major speech in support of his own area redevelopment bill, which was recently passed by the Senate 49-46, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS told a Friday afternoon Senate audience (about six or eight Senators when I was there) that the nearly \$400 million measure for rebuilding rural-urban slums "would not result in a radical new program which has never been tried." Was Mr. DOUGLAS saying that Federal factory-building was an old American usage? Oh, no. "The countries of Western Europe," he went on, "have had similar programs \* \* \* the financing \* \* \* made possible by U.S. foreign aid dollars."

Well, I thought I'd heard everything till now. The DOUGLAS line of reasoning is that the American communities are comparable to the foreign lands which were laid to waste by war and then threatened by Communist overthrow. Great Britain actually went to the halfway house of national socialism and Senator DOUGLAS cited, with seeming approval, the British Distribution of Industry Act, passed in 1945 and extended last year. Under this British law, any community having a high rate of unemployment which is likely to persist would get preferential treatment by the Government. This is legislation which flies in the face of Nature by promoting the preservation of unfit communities. The only foreseeable result would be to perpetuate the obsolete sites where industry and agriculture have failed, and to prevent the natural birth of new cities and farm communities where the future wealth must be created, if at all.

Thus Congressman HECHLER and Senator DOUGLAS are double-teaming, the former to pin down the population of our migratory race with drive-in restaurant service from the Federal granaries, the latter to invest in ghost towns and to make it the business of Congress to prevent (although it won't work) the founding of new Detroit and future Pittsburghs.

There is no denying that the industrial revolution has brought privation and hard luck to many Congressional Districts and States. But this is a modern problem, even futuristic. It won't be solved by imitating the Pharaohs and building pyramids with gang labor in the unproductive desert sands.

Mr. Speaker, I am tickled pink that Mr. Alexander has given me all this free publicity. You know, new Members of Congress sometimes have a hard time trying to convince the folks back home that they are really making a dent on the Washington scene. Statistically, any Member is less than two-tenths percent of the entire membership of Congress, but of course the influence of a freshman Member of the House of Representatives is even less.

When a freshman Member arrives in Washington glowing with the flush of victory, sometimes he feels pretty big. Then comes the big disillusionment

when he is not even recognized by the hotel doorman.

Lucky indeed, then, is the Congressman who incurs the opposition of a columnist—sometimes spelled c-a-l-u-m-n-i-s-t. I am very proud of this column for a number of reasons. I am proud that Mr. Alexander called attention to my efforts to distribute some of our staggering food surpluses to our needy people here in America, for why should there be starvation in the face of bulging granaries? I am proud that Mr. Alexander calls me a "strolling New Dealer"—which is better than being a creeping reactionary. I am proud that he associated me with that noble warrior, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who has always been one of my idols in his battles for economic justice. I am proud, too, that all West Virginians will rise up and demonstrate that their land does not consist of the "desert sands," "ghost towns," and "unfit communities" which Mr. Alexander tries to label them.

Mr. Speaker, men in public life must have a good sense of humor. They must be able to laugh at themselves and enjoy it. If it were not for columnists like Holmes Alexander, I would recommend a program which would transport 20 public officials at a time out to be deposited in folding chairs on the rim of the Grand Canyon for 2-hour periods of silent contemplation every now and then. But fortunate we are that we have people like Mr. Alexander in the business.

Now, if someone would just introduce me to Mr. Westbrook Pegler.

### New York Chamber of Commerce Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker Governor Rockefeller has proclaimed April 12-19 as Chamber of Commerce Week. Practically all chambers of commerce in the State will present programs designed to highlight the importance of the chamber in the community it serves.

The purpose of Chamber of Commerce Week is to: Create a greater public awareness and need for the chamber. Sometimes the chamber does its job so well that it is taken for granted by both the members and the public.

Give recognition to the chamber's staff and volunteer leaders for constructive participation in community affairs.

Give emphasis to the changing character of the work performed by chamber of commerce managers who are striving to achieve professional stature.

Improve and strengthen relations between the chamber and other organizations and agencies in the community.

Stimulate pride of membership among current supporters and encourage others to participate in financing the chamber.

Give credit for past achievements and highlight current activities.

In the spirit dictated by the proclamation, I want to congratulate our own Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce for the splendid work they have done and are doing for the citizens and business people of Brooklyn.

### Economy in Government

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have received scores of letters which say no more than the slogan "balance the budget" or "stop spending." A great historian of the 19th century, Jacob Burckhardt, once said that the 20th century would be the age of the simplifier and the slogan. His prediction has certainly come true. It is not only the totalitarians who have used the slogan and the simplification as a tool to deceive the people. It has also become an advertising and political tool to deceive the people in our society. This has certainly been the case in the present budget conflict.

Eminent economists have pointed out that the present inflation is not an ordinary one. It is not caused by excessive supply of money or greater demand for goods than we are capable of producing. This inflation is a much more subtle one. It is what Gardiner Means calls an administrative inflation. This kind of inflation involves a spiraling in prices in certain basic industries where oligopoly is king. The producers in these industries are noncompetitive. They are able to raise prices at will. They are able to raise prices even though the level of demand for their products has dropped.

In the competitive industries according to the price index from June 1958 through March 1959, there has been somewhat of a stabilization in price. Many economists feel that stability has been achieved because food prices have declined—a decline borne by the farmer in a falling share of the consumers' food dollar—while prices of transportation and medical care have increased.

On the other hand, over this same period of time, wholesale prices of very important groups of oligopoly oriented markets—where the market is controlled by a few great producers—iron and steel, nonferrous metals, hardware, agricultural machinery and equipment, construction and general purpose machinery and equipment, and motor vehicles, have continued to increase. These facts support one interpretation only: The possibilities of further price increase are to be found, if at all, only in the prices of manufactured products that are determined administratively and noncompetitively.

This inflation is the direct result of certain efforts on the part of economic royalists to increase profits to hitherto

unbelievable heights, without lowering prices, expanding, or competing. The fact that the national budget is balanced for 1 year on the ledger books will in no way change the action of these men nor will the dollar be worth any more, nor will we have solved our present inflationary problems.

Another part of the Eisenhower economic program is the tight money policies of the Federal Reserve. Theoretically this policy is to discourage spending in the community in order to encourage competition among sellers and lower prices on goods. The results are exactly the opposite. We have had greater unemployment and more business failures than ever before. The reason why prices have climbed steadily is not hard to understand. A small businessman is destroyed by tight money policies. He is unable to compete because he cannot get credit or capital to either expand or stay in business. On the other hand, big business oligopolies are not sensitive to the policies of the Federal Reserve. Companies such as General Motors and Du Pont, have fantastic credit lines and fantastic reserves. Consequently, the upshot of this is that we depress competition and small business while strengthening monopoly and big business. The policies of this administration have made the American Government the prisoner of the big selfish economic interests in this country. Perpetuation of the present policies by the administration will do no more than strangle national growth and increase economic unemployment while raising prices.

Let the record show that I am for economy in Government. I believe that our entire defense budget should be examined. I believe that we are going to have some startling discoveries from the Hébert Subcommittee on Weapons Systems Contracts, and the Price Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization. I firmly believe that closer analysis of our defense budget will eliminate billions in waste.

I submit that we overhaul our farm program. I submit that the greatest spender of them all is Secretary Benson. He has spent over \$30 billion of our money to prove a theory that was doomed from the start. Mr. Benson has spent more than the combined total spent by all of his predecessors since the beginning of that office in 1862.

When we talk about budget balancing, we should remember that President Truman balanced the budget 6 years out of his 7 years in office while paying \$27 billion on the national debt. Furthermore, President Truman did this while saving Europe from famine and chaos through the Marshall plan, a so-called spending program.

And finally let me state that the House has a long record of showing more concern for a balanced budget than is shown by the President. We may take as examples the years 1954 to 1959, the terms of the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. The reductions for 1954 and 1955 below the President's estimates of appropriations totaled \$14.6 billion; for 1956 and 1957, the reductions totaled \$2.3 billion;

for 1958 and 1959 the reductions below the President's estimates totaled \$5.7 billion. I am sure that the committees and the leadership of this Congress will continue throughout this session and the 1960 session to find more economic and effective ways of putting this Government's resources to use than the methods outlined in the President's budget.

The issues facing this Nation are much graver than this one—especially when we know that the kind of balancing the President calls for will work against the best interests of this Nation while strengthening the hand of the economic royalists.

**Address by the Honorable Stuart Symington, U.S. Senator, at the Kansas Democratic Club in Topeka, Kans.**

# EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a great address was delivered on the evening of April 11 by Hon. STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator from Missouri, before a dinner meeting of the Kansas Democratic Club at the Municipal Auditorium in Topeka, Kans.

An overflow crowd of 600 heard Senator SYMINGTON and enthusiastically demonstrated their approval of his forceful speech. Seating arrangements were insufficient for nearly 300 who had purchased tickets and were compelled to dine in nearby hotels, most of whom returned and stood in the auditorium during the Senator's address.

Kansas democracy is extremely proud of our neighboring statesmen from Missouri, and we hope he will return to the Sunflower State many times in the future and we are certain that he will contribute materially to the great Democratic victory that will be ours in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the address of Senator SYMINGTON be inserted in the RECORD and recommend that it be read by all Members of the House:

### THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM: INVESTMENTS IN THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

It is a real privilege to be here at your annual banquet, and I am very grateful for the honor of being asked to come to Topeka.

This address tonight is not made easier by the distinction of the Democrats who have preceded me. The rolcall of former speakers at this banquet goes all the way back to that great popular leader of democracy, William Jennings Bryan.

It includes such distinguished Americans as Woodrow Wilson, Cordell Hull, and Jouett Shouse; and such good friends as Scott Lucas, Jim Farley, Tom Hennings, and Albert Gore.

In 1951, you were able to hear from that beloved gentleman whose loss we still feel deeply, Alben Barkley.

And in 1957, your speaker was the No. 1 Democrat—not only of my State, but also of the country—Harry S. Truman.

Such distinguished predecessors make one humble; but it is comforting to remember you and I are neighbors.

Your State and mine have a common boundary, including a great river, and this boundary gives us common problems.

There was a time, shortly before, during and after the Civil War, when relations between Kansas and Missouri became a little strained. But that is all over now.

In fact, more and more Kansans and Missourians are seeing eye to eye on matters of politics.

The people of both our States have learned that the best way to obtain effective government for all the people is through the Democratic Party.

Look at the Democratic story right here in your great State.

Thirty years ago—even 20 years ago—if anyone had come to Topeka to talk to a Democratic meeting, he might well have talked to an almost empty hall. What a difference today. You have a Democratic Governor. You have three Democratic Congressmen, and last November you almost elected three more.

And let me make this prediction—in 1960 you'll elect not only three more Congressmen, but a United States Senator along with them.

Yes, my Democratic friends, the record shows that you are making Kansas a real two-party State. That is good for you, good for Kansas and good for America.

Much effort on the part of many people has gone into the building up of our party in Kansas.

And one feature stands out. That is the way your magnificent Governor, George Docking, has won the confidence of the citizens of Kansas.

He has placed your government on a basis of good business management, the kind of management so sadly lacking under the Republicans in Washington today.

Governor Docking has practiced sound economy without sacrificing State services. Through his open door policy toward visitors and the press, he has brought your government closer to the people than ever before.

Every Democrat in America is mighty proud of George Docking.

The Democratic Party has also been strengthened by the record of FLOYD BREEDING in Congress; and I am sure it will be strengthened even more by your new Congressmen, NEWELL GEORGE and DENVER HARGIS.

My friends, seven years ago a group of Republicans came here to Kansas to start a "Crusade."

Today the Republican Party in Washington has dropped all pretense of leading any "crusade."

The watchword on the Potomac now is "politics as usual."

Because time is running out on the Republican administration, capable men are becoming steadily harder to find.

Even when they are found, often they are passed over for important public office because they don't have the blessing of the Republican National Committee.

As their time runs out, we find public officials casting around for cushy corporation jobs in the industries they regulate. This practice does not aid their dedication to the public interest.

The result, if not at times chaos, is something pretty close to it.

In fiscal policy, the Republican theme for the next 2 years seems to be a take-off on the old western song: "There's a tax cut in the sky, by and by."

In defense policy, it is another song: "Praise the Lord, but spare the ammunition."

And this Republican administration is the only government in the history of the world which has undertaken to convince the peo-

ple that they must reduce spending at home while increasing it abroad.

With such policies it is inevitable that the Republicans are approaching the brink of internal chaos among themselves.

Before last fall's elections, a prominent member of the administration wrote a book "A Republican Looks at His Party."

Now we understand he is writing a new one, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

The Republicans are now trying to pull themselves together for the next election—and so they have appointed a large committee whose sole job is to give their party a fresh new image in people's minds.

This phrase "public image" is a bit of Madison Avenue-ese that needs translation into plain English. It means not what you are, but what people think you are.

So the Republicans are trying to find out what will be the best thing for people to think they are. The answer to that is very simple—Democrats.

Any amusement over the plight of the Republican Party, however, should not distract us from where that party has now placed this country.

It takes little vision to realize that the challenge faced today is greater than any ever faced before by the United States.

The philosophy of State supremacy, as expressed in the Communist dictatorship, has declared economic, psychological, sociological, technological, political, and at times military war against us.

A mighty effort is being made to isolate us in a world where lethal weapons can go from continent to continent in less than 30 minutes. Yet our response to this challenge continues to be slow, grumbling, and inadequate.

The same is true here at home. We are not planning adequate education for our children, or proper conservation of our resources, or enough protection for those citizens who have made their contribution and have now reached the evening of their lives. The chief excuse the Republicans give for this drifting, both at home and abroad, is that if we try to do better we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

In 1889, for the first time in peacetime, the Congress appropriated a billion dollars. In those days the Speaker of the House was a Republican—Thomas Reed. And when people complained to him about his billion-dollar Congress, Tom Reed said: "Yes; but this is a billion-dollar country." I wish the Republicans today had some of Tom Reed's commonsense.

Measured by our national product, we now have a \$450-billion country—the greatest, richest, most resourceful country in the world. We can afford whatever is necessary for the good of America.

We Democrats are labeled "reckless spenders," but this is just another charge not supported by the facts. Between 1947 and 1952 the Democratic administration showed a net surplus of \$4 billion. Between the fiscal years of 1954 and 1959 the Republican administration operated at a net deficit of \$20 billion. And last year this administration ran up the largest peacetime deficit in our history.

Now there is a significant difference between what the two parties want to spend for. We Democrats want to increase spending for assets—for schools and roads, hospitals and dams, and airports. Based on the record, Republicans have increased spending for interest. Since 1953 the annual interest on the national debt has increased by \$1½ billion, and is now the second largest single item in the budget.

They want to save dollars. We do, too; but we also want to save farms and cities and useful lives.

They have adopted the philosophy that high permanent unemployment is now characteristic of capitalism. We want to give

every American who wants to work a chance to work, in order to strengthen the country.

They believe in retrenchment to balance the budget. We believe the way to balance the budget is through the prosperity of full production.

The bills we Democrats are pushing in this Congress—bills for airports, schools, and housing—are not spending bills. They are investment bills—investments in a brighter future for America.

Some people say, "You're right; we do need these projects, but we can't afford them unless we either raise taxes or run a deficit." But if we had today a businesslike administration, we wouldn't have to raise taxes.

You all know my ideas of the billions which could be saved if we started operating our defenses on the basis of progress instead of continuing to let them drift on the basis of tradition.

Now let me give you another interesting case, released recently by the Internal Revenue Service. That Service audited some 36,000 returns of business and professional taxpayers. They found that, if the same kind of audit could be extended to 6,700,000 returns for the same year, the taxable income of these taxpayers would have been increased by 20 percent. And that would have yielded \$2.7 billion in additional taxable income. In other words, if we had enforced efficiently the present tax laws, we could have obtained taxes on \$2.7 billion more without changing the tax rates at all.

When it took office, this administration fired 3,000 people from the enforcement section of the Internal Revenue Department. What a false sense of economy. Even if the salaries of these 3,000 people averaged \$10,000 a year—which they didn't—would the saving of that \$30 million justify tax evaders dodging the payment of billions? So you see these poor managers have billions of dollars of additional taxable income available right under their noses if they would only put in good business practices to collect it.

As Americans, we want this tax money and all tax money to be spent for the best possible investments in prosperity and peace. As Kansans and Missourians, we know that one of the most solid of all investments lies in the control of water, primarily flood control.

We all remember the flood on the Kaw and the Missouri in 1951. It cost the Kansas City area alone \$1 billion. The tax revenue lost to the Government as a result of that one flood was greater than the entire cost of the projects which could have prevented it.

Despite such occurrences, the present administration refuses to invest in water projects. Projects like those at Lawrence, Fort Scott, Melvern, and Hillsdale are being held up by the sharp budget ax of this Republican administration. The Republican policy toward water resource development seems to be: cut now, suffer later. Water projects are needed also for industrial development. New industries are springing up each day. Factories are looking for good places to locate. A new industry needs space and also needs a steady supply of adequate fresh water.

Kansas has acres of land ready for industrial development. If the abundant water resources you now have were properly utilized so they could go to work for industry, your future prosperity would be placed on a broader, firmer footing.

Now a word about our farm program. It is not necessary to tell a Kansas farmer that our present agriculture program is a mess. He knows it. In the past 6 years, the leaders in the Department of Agriculture have built a record which even they are now ashamed of. They have spent \$30 billion of our money on a farm program that just doesn't work. Secretary Ezra Taft Benson has spent more money than all the 14 preceding Secretaries of Agriculture combined.

And what has he produced? Low farm prices, high food prices, and a mountain of surplus foods.

Before coming into Government, I was a businessman for a good many years. If any businessman tried to run his plant or office the way the Department of Agriculture has been run for over 6 years, he would go broke. Back in 1952 and 1953, the Eisenhower-Benson crusade was going to get the Government out of farming. Well, let's look at the record. In January of 1953, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned \$1 billion of farm commodities. In January of 1959—just 6 years later—that inventory was well over \$5 billion. And according to the latest Department of Agriculture report, just released last week, the total investment in farm commodities—inventories and loans—is over \$9 billion.

But this is not all, because in his last budget message to Congress, the President admitted that by June of 1960, the total investment would be \$10 billion. Based on information presented to the Senate Agriculture Committee, and my own study of the situation, I believe the President much underestimated, and that by June 1960 Government investment in farm commodities will be close to \$12 billion. How's that for getting the Government out of farming?

Mr. Benson goes around the country speaking in such great agricultural centers as various city chambers of commerce, complaining about the farm problem. But what plans has he made to solve that problem?

A few weeks ago, when Mr. Benson came before our committee to ask authority to spend more billions, we asked him questions any banker would ask a businessman who requested a loan. I asked him if he had any definite plans to move his gigantic inventory. He conferred with several of his 14 assistants who were back-stopping him at the hearing. Then said he had no definite plans.

I asked him how much inventory he thought he would move this year. He said he did not know.

I asked him how long it would take to move it. He said he didn't know that either.

Mr. Benson should know that his farm program is bankrupt primarily because it is based on the false theory that the way to lower farm production is to reduce farm prices. As millions of farmers and many of us in Congress have insisted for a number of years, this theory just does not work. And here is why. We all know there are fixed costs connected with farming—payments on notes and mortgages, installment payments on equipment, out-of-pocket costs for fertilizer, seed, fuel, and such. In recent years, these costs have been steadily going up. To meet these fixed and out of pocket expenses, and at the same time take care of family expenses, farmers must have a minimum income. That income, of course, is derived from price times volume minus costs.

If your price goes down at the same time your costs go up—and that has been the case in recent years—you have only two choices: Increase your volume, or go broke.

In the past 6 years nearly 4 million farm people have been forced off our farms. But the rest of our farmers have taken the other course. They have taken advantage of every new technique of farming to vastly increase their production.

The story on wheat is a typical example. Since 1952, wheat price supports have dropped from \$2.20 to \$1.80. Has this brought about lower production or expanded consumption? Of course not.

While the price of wheat to farmers has dropped 18 percent since 1952, per capita consumption of wheat has decreased 11 percent. Last year wheat production set an

all-time high—nearly 1.5 billion bushels—and this was with some 5 million acres in the soil bank.

In an effort to deal with the wheat situation, the Senate Agriculture Committee asked the Secretary to submit a new wheat bill. He offered two alternative suggestions. One of these was, in effect, no price-support program at all. Under this alternative, wheat price supports would be as low as 75 percent, not of parity, but of the average price during the last 3 years. It is a farce to call this a price support. A price 25 percent below what you have been getting isn't any support. At best, it is a floor with a hole in it.

The ultimate goal of the Eisenhower-Benson wheat plan is to lower prices until "price supports are adapted to feed use relationships." Those are Mr. Benson's own words.

Do you know what the price of wheat would be under such an arrangement?

My good friend, Senator MUR YOUNG, of North Dakota, and I asked the Agriculture Department about this. They finally admitted that, at present corn and feed grain prices, wheat price supports would be between \$1.15 and \$1.20 a bushel, in order to be at "feed use relationship." Long before the price got that low, thousands of wheat farmers would go broke, and Mr. Benson knows it.

The other alternative wheat plan suggested by the administration would lower prices; and, at the same time, sharply reduce wheat acreage. This is no wheat program. It is just a rehash of the same old Benson policy of economic attrition.

With the cooperation of the farmers of America, we in the Congress plan to write a new farm bill. This bill will include an effective wheat program based on sound economic principles, and on the belief that farm families deserve an opportunity to earn a return on their labor, investment and managerial ability comparable to that earned by other segments of the economy.

Last month we held comprehensive hearings on new wheat legislation; and heard representatives from many of the farm organizations, from the National Association of Wheat Growers, and from others interested in sound new wheat legislation.

There are certain basic requirements which must be included in any sound effective farm program. That program must give the farmer a fair price for his product. It must give farmers the tools whereby they can compete more favorably with the other closely organized segments of the economy. Any sound long-range farm program must be designed to bring farm production more nearly in line with realistic needs—at home and abroad.

It must face up to the gigantic inventory problem. The productive capacity of the American farmer is not an economic curse. It is, and it should be handled as, a blessing. With wise policies, we can use this capacity to further prosperity at home and peace and prosperity abroad.

Millions of our own people in the United States are undernourished. One hundred thousand children in one of our States have only one-third of the calories and proteins they need in their daily diet. Throughout the world, millions suffer from starvation, while the food that could nourish them, stored at a cost the President himself says amounts to a billion dollars a year, wastes away in our storage bins and warehouses.

The people of other nations are like our people. They want peace in the world. They want food and clothing for themselves and their children. If we can move our food inventories to people in need, we will be using our country's greatest blessing to accomplish our country's noblest purpose.

Twice in our history while under Democratic leadership, this Nation has been called

upon to fight for freedom. Today, as Democrats, but primarily as Americans, we demand that our country be made strong enough to preserve our freedom. But this in no way impairs our dedication to peace. In fact, it would further that dedication.

The two greatest charters of peace in our history were drafted by Democrats, the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson and the 4 freedoms of Franklin Roosevelt. Today, we Democrats again advocate the path to peace through a universal disarmament agreement, negotiated from a position of strength.

With firm leadership, we can create an America greater than any we have ever known. With firm leadership we can create the kind of permanent peace our forefathers and our sons dreamed of and died for.

We should dedicate ourselves to creating the kind of permanent peace that would justify our going anywhere in the world and saying with even greater pride, "I am an American."

### Inching Along Toward Peace

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 30, during the recent Easter recess, it was my privilege to address the Dade County Bar Association in Miami, Fla. I spoke on the subject of the Berlin crisis and set forth my ideas on the course of action we should follow in order to protect free West Berlin and maintain the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that my address, entitled "Inching Along Toward Peace," be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INCHING ALONG TOWARD PEACE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, before Dade County Bar Association, Miami, Fla., March 30, 1959)

We live in a time of continuous crisis. We have been numbed by screaming headlines about Suez, Germany, Baghdad, and Budapest. Now we are in the middle of the Berlin crisis. This is not just another international crisis. It is probably the most serious and fateful problem faced by the United States and the free world since the end of World War II.

We all know what is at stake in Berlin—the two things we value most—peace and freedom. A false move or a serious miscalculation could be the spark that would ignite a nuclear holocaust. If free West Berlin falls, it is not inconceivable that West Germany would eventually follow, and if West Germany falls, the nightmare of a new tyranny would sweep over all of Europe.

Berlin is the focal point in the mighty struggle between Communist tyranny and the free world. The situation is fraught with danger. But I believe that firmness, wisdom, and solidarity with our closest allies will give us the strength we need to meet the challenge posed by Mr. Khrushchev's thinly disguised ultimatum which falls due on May 27.

In my remarks about the seriousness of the Berlin crisis I would like to make a few general observations in the interests of understanding. I do not want to say or do

anything that will make the job of the executive branch any more difficult than it now is. In fact, I seriously considered whether I should say anything at all in public on so delicate an issue. I hope my comments will help to clarify the situation in its deepest and broadest aspects.

A sound policy toward the Berlin crisis will require all the patience, understanding, and courage we can muster.

If the American people understand the depth of the crisis I believe they will be willing to pay the price to save West Berlin. We know that peace and freedom are indivisible and that both are at stake in Berlin. And if freedom is snuffed out in Berlin the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world will suffer.

The gravity of the Berlin crisis necessitates that we enter into face-to-face talks with Russian leaders.

In his address to the American people the President rightly insisted on both firmness and our willingness to negotiate—as many of us have been urging. I am gratified that he is now willing to go to the summit.

We must always be ready to undertake any honorable move that will further prospects of peace.

The test of our greatness and leadership is not to be found in the formalities of diplomacy, but, rather, in the sincerity of our purpose. With a large part of the world in the control of dictators, vital decisions will be made by heads of state. To suggest otherwise is to ignore the real facts of political life. Therefore, let us proceed to the summit conference fully prepared with purpose and program, and in unity with our allies. We must do our homework better than we have in the past, and know what we want and what we are going to propose.

The willingness to negotiate is only the beginning, not the end, of a responsible policy toward the German situation. Our major problem now is to develop a viable negotiating posture in concert with Britain, France, and West Germany. To enter into talks with the Russians, either at the foreign ministers' level or heads of state level, ill-prepared or disunited, is to invite humiliation and even disaster.

I want to emphasize to you today my belief that it would be excessively imprudent to hold the proposed summit conference without utilizing the unique facilities of the United Nations.

As we go into the coming summit conference, we need to invoke the moral authority of the purposes and principles embodied in the charter of the United Nations.

And, in my opinion, the best way to do it effectively is to hold the summit conference within the framework of the United Nations.

We can't be part-time members of the U.N. turning to it in desperation at the last moment only after we have bungled efforts to solve the world's problems alone. We can't take an off-again, on-again attitude toward the United Nations, if we want to help keep it an effective force for peace.

When we had a crisis in the Middle East and Russia proposed a summit conference, we insisted that any such conference be held through the United Nations.

Yet now, as we approach a summit conference which all agree is urgent, we seem to have regrettably turned our back on the U.N.—and our back upon our other allies we represent in the occupation of Berlin.

The presence of the Secretary-General at a summit conference would mean the symbolic representation of all the members of the United Nations who may object to four powers presuming to settle an issue which can mean peace or war for the entire world. Peace is the responsibility of all nations.

It is not only the conference itself which should be brought within the framework of the United Nations. There is also the

brighter prospect through such a conference of bringing within the framework of the United Nations the administration of any eventual agreement of a safer regime for Berlin. Such a regime might well include a permanent U.N. presence for Berlin.

The United Nations Charter recognizes the role of normal diplomacy, and charges the nations to seek solutions to their problems in the first instance through peaceful means of their own choice.

Nevertheless, the presumption must be that in dealing with general problems which threaten international peace and security, international conferences should be conducted within the framework of the United Nations.

The United Nations offers many advantages for international conferences, whether involving few or many States.

One of the advantages of a conference within the framework of the U.N. is that such a conference has the moral backing of the charter, and would be directed toward objectives compatible with the purposes of the charter.

Our purpose, in any summit conference, would stand that test. It would be Soviet purposes that would become subjected to world scrutiny.

#### WHAT THE COMMUNISTS WANT

It seems to me that the Soviet Union wants three things in Europe and has created the Berlin crisis as a lever to gain them:

1. The Soviet Union wants the three Western Powers to get out of West Berlin. It ultimately wants the entire city to be under complete Communist control.

2. She wants to use the Berlin crisis to force the Western Powers to negotiate an all-German settlement favorable to the Soviet Union. She prefers a united Germany tied closely to the Communist bloc. She will settle immediately for two Germanies. In other words, the status quo with East Germany the Communist state under firm Soviet control and influence. The least acceptable alternative that the Soviet appears willing to consider is a neutralized and denuclearized Germany which she hopes eventually to swallow up, by one means or another.

3. The Soviet Union sees in the Berlin crisis an opportunity to split the Western alliance. We must never forget that the primary objective of Soviet policy in Europe is to weaken NATO and to divide the United States from her allies. We cannot permit any of these Soviet objectives to be fulfilled. It is inconceivable that we would retreat from West Berlin. To do so would be to forfeit world leadership and in fact to become a second-rate power. I am convinced that the Soviet Union prefers to gain its political objective in Europe without nuclear war, and I know that the United States and our allies want to avoid a nuclear Armageddon.

We should make every effort to avoid getting into a position where we would be required to use force first. I am sure our Government will do everything possible to avoid a provocative or hostile act. We should, however, make it crystal clear that we will not be forced out of Berlin, nor be denied access to or in any way accede to any effort to starve into submission the West Berlin population. It must be clearly understood by Moscow and East Germany that we are prepared to take any action necessary in support of these policies and commitments.

#### U.S. POLICY OF RESOLUTE FIRMNESS

Last November I stood in West Berlin with its able and courageous mayor, Willy Brandt. I vowed then, and I vow today, to support a policy of firmness, to uphold the right of France, Britain, and the United States to maintain garrisons in West Berlin until a legitimate peace treaty is signed.

This is the position and policy of our Government. We can all be grateful that we

do not stand alone. Britain, France, and the 12 other members of the NATO alliance stand with us. We will not surrender. We will not be pushed out.

What does standing firm mean? It does not mean holding fast inflexibility to old positions which have helped to produce the present unhappy stalemate. The real issue, said Walter Lippmann recently, is "whether to stand pat on positions that have become untenable or to move to new positions from which the Western allies can recover the political initiative." Standing firm means that we must match our firmness with imagination, courage, and a willingness to negotiate with the Soviet Union. It means firmness in our fundamental position and flexibility in our strategy and tactics. Standing firm and willingness to negotiate are not, as some people suggest, contradictory policies. They are two elements in any viable policy in the Berlin crisis. We must stand firm in order to negotiate effectively. And we must have solid bases for negotiation if we want to stand firm.

It is imperative that the best minds of our country—those persons qualified as experts on the problems of Central Europe and Germany as well as Soviet policies and tactics—be called upon at once for intensive consultation directed toward policy formulation.

In the weeks between now and May 27, we, in concert with our allies, must explore every possible honorable means that can ease this crisis and point in the direction of a just and equitable settlement.

It is not enough just to negotiate and talk. We must have clearly in mind the objectives we seek, and the means and ways of achieving those objectives without bargaining away the rights of others, or in any way weakening our own security.

I am gratified that our Government is at last taking anew the leadership in preparing for these important conferences.

Yet I would be less than candid if I did not warn the American not to expect quick and easy solutions out of the impending negotiations.

It must constantly be kept in mind that there are no short-time, short-run, immediate answers to these grave, perplexing, long-range problems. Negotiations will require persistent patience. They will require a willingness to endure almost unbelievable, tedious discussions of long duration.

But we must be prepared to negotiate and negotiate as long as there is the slightest prospect of relieving world tension and minimize the danger of war.

The hope of peace and understanding with the Soviet Union is not to be found in political deals.

We cannot leap over our problems and differences.

They must be slowly chipped away, through our contacts in the United Nations, our participations with the Soviet in the U.N. agencies, through our exchange programs, and what we hope will be gradual changes within the Soviet Union.

At best, we will inch along toward peace and understanding.

Let us hope and pray we have the emotional stability and maturity to persevere. And let us hope and pray that no attempts will be made to find quick solutions which will ultimately be regretted because of ill-considered actions or ill-advised consideration.

We know that our national security is not and should not be a partisan matter. But genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy does not mean that the loyal opposition silently acquiesces in all policies advanced by the administration.

The Berlin crisis is both a danger and an opportunity. It is a danger to world peace if we display signs of weakness, indecision, or appeasement. It is an opportunity if we recognize the sharpness of the crisis and proceed to explore every means of peaceful settlement, not only of the Berlin and German situation, but indeed the relationships between the United States, its allies, and the Soviet Union in all of Central Europe. Wise, prudent, and courageous statesmanship is needed now as never before. We must be prepared to follow the course that may be tedious, frustrating, and characterized by insults, threats, and abuses for months to come. The war of nerves has been intensified.

In this struggle, the victory will come to those who clearly understand the relationship between power and principle, maneuver, and objective. We cannot afford to be found wanting in any of these.

Make no mistake about it, a policy of firmness with negotiation is the only policy that will avoid surrender on the one side, and minimize the risks of war on the other.

#### COOPERATION WITH ALLIES AND RESTRAINT URGED

We must act in harmony with our allies, Britain, France, and West Germany. This means more than coordinating our pronouncements about standing firm. It means hammering out a unified policy and strategy to give us strength for bargaining, and to undergird our determination if negotiation should break down.

If we had worked a bit closer with our allies and had strengthened the consultative process within NATO during the past 5 years, perhaps we would be in a better position than we are today. But let bygones be bygones. If we ever needed the wisdom, strength, and counsel of trusted allies we need them now.

Yes, these are dangerous days and the situation is explosive. But these are also great

and challenging days where spiritual and brain power may save us from the dangerous alternative of the use of firepower.

The alternative to war is peace, and it is in the pursuit of peace that we will find our greatness and fulfill our destiny.

## Boland Pays Tribute to Secretary Dulles

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the resignation of Secretary of State Dulles. I am sure that all of the peoples of the free world feel likewise. He had a profound knowledge of world affairs gleaned over a lifetime of study and experience.

In my judgment, he was a great Secretary of State who served in that post during one of the most difficult diplomatic periods in the history of our Nation.

#### DULLES' CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTENANCE OF WESTERN ALLIANCE

Despite great personal sacrifices, he made exhausting trips throughout the world and successfully matched wits with the Communists. His contribution was immeasurable in keeping the Western Alliance together under the most trying circumstances.

His role was compounded with difficulty because he could place little or no reliance on the words of his Soviet adversaries. Yet he had a sixth sense in anticipating Soviet weakness and he was a master at persuading Western statesmen to stand firm with him on vital issues. His adamant position forced the Soviet to retreat many times.

#### HE WAS ONE OF THE WORLD'S OUTSTANDING STATESMEN

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when historians view his tenure in perspective, they will record that Secretary of State Dulles was one of the outstanding statesmen in the fight against the spread of communism.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1959

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 15, 1959)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, and who changeth not, abide with us, even as earth's joys grow dim and its glories pass away.

With tender solicitude, we lift up in our prayer this day a great servant of the State whose iron will, moral standards,

and passion for the coronation of righteousness and decency in international affairs, across these critical years, have been a bulwark of our liberties and the voice of our America, as our free land has faced, and faces, ruthless foes bent on her destruction.

As with courage which shames our coward fears and a faith deep-rooted in a religion which is his very life, Thy servant—John Foster Dulles—stands in the valley of the shadow, while the Nation he serves with such devotion and the free world cemented in unity by his wisdom and inflexible exertions lift grateful petitions for the smitten warrior who is facing the unseen with a cheer. May he fear no evil, as Thy rod and Thy staff comfort and sustain him.

And, as with his faith, we face the crisis of the coming days—

God be in our head,  
And in our understanding;  
God be in our eyes,  
And in our looking;  
God be in our mouth,  
And in our speaking;  
God be in our heart,  
And in our thinking;  
God be at our end,  
And at our departing.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading